

Gift of Mr. A. A. Sweet

Library of

Wellesley



College.

Presented by Mr. A. A. Sweet

No 45489

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. VII.

List of Contributors to Volume VII.

- WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, B.A.
REV. CLEMENT BIRD, M.A.
REV. PROF. A. B. BRUCE, D.D.
RIGHT REV. W. B. CARPENTER, D.D., BISHOP OF RIPON.
VERY REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D.
REV. JOHN A. CROSS, M.A.
REV. T. HERBERT DARLOW, M.A.
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
REV. JAMES DENNEY, B.D.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
REV. PROF. G. G. FINDLAY, M.A.
RIGHT REV. LORD A. C. HERVEY, D.D., BISHOP OF BATH
AND WELLS.
REV. ALEX. MAIR, D.D.
REV. PROF. W. MILLIGAN, D.D.
REV. J. O. F. MURRAY, M.A.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, M.A.
REV. PROF. J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON, M.A.
REV. PROF. W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D.
REV. PROF. G. A. SMITH, D.D.
REV. WALTER C. SMITH, D.D., LL.D.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. PROF. V. H. STANTON, D.D.
REV. JOHN TAYLOR, D.LIT.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FOURTH SERIES.

Volume VII.

London:
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCHII.

45431

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

BS
410
F7
III. 4

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

I. THE SOURCES.

Two important questions may be asked concerning Paul's Christian theology: where did he get it? and, whence do we obtain our knowledge of it? It is with the latter of these questions that we are now to be occupied. By "sources" is here meant the literary materials available for becoming acquainted with the great Gentile Apostle's characteristic way of thinking on the leading themes connected with the Christian faith.

If we wanted to know, as far as is possible, all that Paul thought on any topic relating to the faith, we should have to regard all his extant epistles as our sources, and our first task would be to ascertain to the best of our ability how many of the separate writings ascribed to him in the New Testament are authentic. If, on the other hand, our aim be, as it is, to determine the nature of the distinctively Pauline type of Christianity, to make ourselves acquainted with what Paul called his gospel,¹ or what, in modern phrase, we call *Paulinism*, it is really not necessary to do more than study carefully four of the reputedly Pauline Epistles, those viz. to the Galatian, Corinthian and Roman churches respectively. This limitation of the field to be studied, while reducing the subject to manageable dimensions, may be justified by other considerations possessing more weight than can attach to reasons of personal convenience.

Among these considerations a foremost place is due to the fact that the four epistles referred to are generally recognised

¹ Romans xvi. 25.

by Biblical critics of all schools as indubitably genuine.¹ Apart altogether from personal convictions, even though one may have little or no doubt as to the authenticity of any one of the thirteen letters,² it is due to the actual state of critical opinion that in a scientific attempt to ascertain the nature of Paul's Christian teaching, primary importance should be attached to the Epistles which command a general, if not quite universal, consensus of critical approval. Other epistles may legitimately be cited by any writer on Paulinism who has no doubt as to their genuineness, but even in that case, if he is to pursue a strictly scientific method, only in the second place. It will be understood of course that in a homiletic use of Scripture this distinction between primary and secondary may be disregarded.

The four Epistles in question have the advantage of being more or less controversial in their nature. This is, it must be owned, not advantageous in all respects. A polemical origin is in some ways prejudicial to the quality and value of a writing. Controversy readily leads to the placing of an undue emphasis on some aspects of truth to the neglect of others not in themselves unimportant. It involves an unwelcome descent from the serene region of intuition to the lower and stormier region of argumentation. The rôle of the prophet or seer is replaced by that of the theological doctor. On both accounts the quality of temporariness is

¹ There is a school of critics possessing hardihood enough to call in question the genuineness of even these Epistles. Its best known representative is Rudolf Steck, who has expounded his views in a work recently published on the Epistle to the Galatians (*Der Galaterbrief nach seiner Aechtheit untersucht*, 1888). The assumption which underlies his criticism is that the sharp opposition to Judaistic Christianity revealed in the Epistle did not really exist in Paul's time, but came much later as the result of a gradual development which reached its culminating point about the time of Marcion. On this new criticism, which I cannot bring myself to take seriously, see some remarks of Lipsius in the introduction to his Commentary on Galatians, etc., in the *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament*. This school of New Testament criticism corresponds in character to that of Vernes and Havet in the Old Testament, who make the prophets post-exilian.

² Of course the *Epistle to the Hebrews* is left out of account.

apt, in some measure, to characterise all controversial writings. When the occasion is past the one-sidedness to which it gave rise ceases to satisfy. Arguments which told at the time when the controversy raged lose their cogency, though the truths they were employed to defend possess perennial importance. Yet, on the other hand, the literature of a great debate, which formed a crisis in the religious history of the world, must possess an exceptional and imperishable worth. The thoughts of men at such a time are clear, for they define themselves against those of opponents. We have a twofold clue to their meaning, their own words, and the views of those against whom they contend. Then the deepest thoughts of men's minds are brought to light at such a crisis. Conflict sets their hearts on fire, and stimulates to the uttermost their intellectual powers; they say therefore what is dear to them as life, and they say all in the most energetic manner.

These remarks have their full application to the four Epistles which we may conveniently distinguish as the *controversial* group among the Pauline writings. The issue involved is clear: we have no difficulty in knowing what were the views of those against whose evil influence the Apostle sought to fortify the churches to which he wrote. In other Epistles, such as that to the Colossians, we can only guess what were the unwholesome tendencies the writer desired to counteract. The issue is also vital. The controversy concerns nothing less than the nature and destination of Christianity. Here therefore, if anywhere, we may expect to learn what Paul deems central and essential in the Christian faith, to get to the very bottom of his mind and heart as a believer in Jesus; and all the more that the foes he fights are not only the men of his own house, but the very impersonation of his former self. They advocate what he once held, they represent religious tendencies which formerly made him a determined enemy of Christianity, and

a relentless persecutor of all who bore the Christian name. With what passion, yes, and with what pathos, he must throw himself into such a quarrel! We may expect to find in what he writes bearing thereon not merely much fresh original thought trenchantly expressed, but here and there autobiographical hints, involuntary self-revelations, the man unveiled alongside of the theologian. It will be our own fault if in our hands these writings become dry scholastic productions.

Even in reference to what is specific or peculiar in later Epistles we may find a sufficient indication of Paul's view in the controversial group. So for example in the case of what are called the *prison* Epistles, whose special characteristic is the prominence given to Christology, on which account they are sometimes distinguished as the *Christological* group.¹ There is quite enough Christology in the four great controversial Epistles to show us what Paul thought concerning the great object of the Christian's faith and reverence. The Christological Epistles contain interesting and valuable statements concerning the Lord Jesus which repay earnest study, but the Christ-idea of these Epistles embraces little, if anything, essential in advance of what can be gathered from the relative texts in the controversial Epistles. The person of Christ is more prominently the theme of the former as compared with the latter, but the doctrine taught is not higher, though it is applied in new directions.

Besides these two groups of Epistles, there are other two containing respectively the earliest and the latest of Paul's reputed writings preserved in the New Testament, the one consisting of the two Epistles to the church of Thessalonica, the other of the two to Timothy and the one to Titus, called from their leading subject-matter the *pastoral*

¹ This group includes the Epistles to the Ephesian, Philippian and Colossian churches; also the Epistle to Philemon, which, however, possesses no doctrinal significance.

Epistles. Neither of these groups yields a contribution of importance to *Paulinism*, if we use that term to denote not what Paul wrote casually on any subject whatever connected with the Christian faith, but the distinctively Pauline system of thought on essential aspects of the faith. In the former are to be found no definite specific formulations of belief, but only general and elementary statements of truth; while the latter, in so far as they refer to matters of faith, but repeat familiar Pauline ideas as commonplaces, their proper occasion and speciality being to supply directions with reference to ecclesiastical organization.

These four groups of letters, written at different times, the earliest separated from the latest by a period of some sixteen years, naturally suggest a question which may here be briefly touched on. Was there any growth in Paul's mind in relation to Christianity, or must we conceive of his system of Christian thought as the same at all stages of his history, poured out at the first in one gush, so to speak, and setting thereafter into an unchangeable rigid form? On this question opinion is greatly divided. Sabatier *e.g.* earnestly contends for growth, and makes it his business to prove and exhibit it by analysis of the different groups of Epistles, beginning with the Epistles to the Thessalonians called the *mission* group, and supposed to show the apostle's way of thinking before the great controversy arose, and passing in succession through the controversial and the Christological groups to the pastoral.¹ Pfeiderer, on the other hand, inclines to the other alternative.² The difference between these two authors, however, does not consist in this that the one affirms and the

¹ Vide his *L'Apôtre Paul*, translated into English and published by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton; a most suggestive and helpful book, whatever one may think of his theory as to the development of doctrine in the mind of the apostle.

² Vide his *Der Paulinismus*. Ménégos (*Le Péché et La Rédemption d'après Saint Paul*, 1882) speaks of these two works by Sabatier and Pfeiderer as best indicating the present state of thought on Paulinism.

other denies the existence of traces of advance, development or modification of view within the range of the Epistles ascribed to Paul. The point of difference is that the one holds that the growth was in Paul's own views and teaching, and the other that the growth was not in Paul, but in *Paulinism*, that is in the conception of Christianity which took its origin from Paul, and in its main features was adopted by a section of the church, and in the hands of his followers underwent expansion and modification. The facts founded on in the maintenance of the two rival hypotheses are much the same. They are such as these, that in the Epistle to the Colossians, for example, a somewhat higher view of the Person of Christ is presented than in the four undisputed Epistles, that Christ's work is there regarded from a somewhat novel point of view, that a less purely negative attitude towards the law is therein assumed than that which characterises the controversial Epistles, and that the whole subject of Christianity is contemplated in a metaphysical way *sub specie æternitatis*, rather than in the historical manner of the earlier Epistles. The use made of the facts is very different. One says: having regard to such facts, it is evident to me that Paul's mind underwent a process of vital growth as years passed, and new circumstances arose to stimulate that ever active powerful intellect to fresh thought on the great theme which engrossed its attention. The other says: having regard to these phenomena, I have no hesitation in affirming that this Epistle to the Colossians is not of Pauline authorship, though I am sure it proceeded from the Pauline school, for the affinities between it and the undoubted writings of Paul are very marked. In presence of such contrariety of opinion, and considering the importance of the issues involved, it is necessary to come to some sort of conclusion as to this question of growth. Now there is no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis of development as applied to Paul's personal apprehension of the significance of Christianity. Growth

in knowledge as in grace is the law of ordinary Christian life, and there is no stringent reason why we should regard Paul as an exception. Inspiration is no such reason. Inspiration was compatible with its possessor knowing in part and prophesying in part, for Paul predicates such partiality of himself.¹ But if inspiration be compatible with knowing in part at the best, it is also compatible with knowing less at one time than at another. We know moreover that it was not God's way to reveal all truth at one time to the agents of revelation. He spoke in many parts and in many modes by the prophets to the fathers. Why should He not follow the same method with the apostles: not communicating to them at once a full understanding of the Christian faith in all its bearings, but simply providing that their insight should keep pace with events, so that they should always be able to give the church such guidance as was required? The mere fact therefore that one of Paul's reputed Epistles contains teaching on any subject in advance of that found in admittedly Pauline Epistles is not of itself any proof that that Epistle is not also Pauline. Questions of genuineness must be settled on independent grounds.²

Thus far as to the *a priori* aspect of the question. But how now as to the matter of fact? Is there any reason to believe *e.g.* that Paul had a much clearer and deeper insight into the nature and destination of Christianity when he wrote the controversial epistles, than at the time of his conversion some twenty years before, or during the earlier years of his missionary activity? The supposition is in itself reasonable

¹ 1 Corinthians xiii. 2.

² Ménégoz admits not only the possibility but the reality of a development in Paul's thought. But he holds that whatever development there was took place before the writing of the Epistle to the Galatians, which, he thinks, came next in the order of time to the Epistles to the Thessalonians. In the other Epistles from *Galatians* onwards, he finds no advance in thought. It cannot be proved, he thinks, that the Christology of *Romans* is behind that of *Colossians*, though Christology is not its speciality, as it is of the latter. *Le Péché et la Rédemption*, pp. 7, 9.

and credible, and the burden of proof may seem to lie on those who deny it. Much depends on the way in which we conceive the conversion and what it involved. For some that event signifies very little, for others it means almost everything characteristic in Pauline Christianity. I shall have occasion to state my own view in another paper, and must not anticipate what I have to say there. Leaving over the psychological aspect of the question till then, I can now only refer to what may be supposed to make for the hypothesis of growth in the extant Pauline literature.

The two Epistles to the Thessalonians have been supposed to furnish indisputable evidence that, previous to the great controversy, Paul's way of thinking was of a simpler, less developed type than is found in the controversial group. Along with the reports of Pauline discourses in the Book of *Acts*, they have been regarded as a source of knowledge concerning what is called *Primitive Paulinism*, understood to signify not merely what Paul thought it fitting to teach to infant churches founded in the course of his missionary journeys, but his own way of conceiving the Gospel antecedent to the great anti-Judaistic controversy. Now that these Epistles do present to our view what we may call a rudimentary Gospel, interesting to note, and, as will hereafter appear, justifying an important inference, is beyond doubt. But it by no means follows that that rudimentary Gospel represents all what Paul then knew, and that all the great deep thoughts found in the four controversial Epistles lay as yet beneath his mental horizon. To satisfy ourselves of this we have only to reflect when the Epistles in question were written, and what had happened before they were penned. It is not necessary to enquire into exact dates; it is enough to say that the Thessalonian letters presuppose a Thessalonian church, and could not have been written before that church was founded, and until it had had some experiences calling for such instruction and counsel as the

letters contain. Turning now to the memoirs of Paul's missionary activity in the Acts, to which critics of all schools attach considerable historical value, what do we find? That Paul's visit to Thessalonica is placed after the Council in Jerusalem, at which the critical question of circumcision was discussed and provisionally settled. That is to say, the cleavage between the Apostle of the Gentiles who appeared at that Council as the enthusiastic champion of Gentile liberties, and those who took a narrow, conservative view of the question at issue, had taken place at least a year or two before the letters to the Thessalonian church could possibly have been written. How keenly alive to the issues at stake Paul was at the time when the Council met, we learn from his own memoranda preserved in his Epistle to the Galatians, where in language thrilling with passion he refers to "false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty, which we have in Christ Jesus."¹ If the Apostle had not thought out his Gospel before, here was a crisis to set him thinking, and to stimulate a very rapid theological development. It may be taken for granted that by the time he wrote his Epistles to the Thessalonians, during his long sojourn in Corinth,² all his most characteristic ideas had taken their place in his system of religious thought. Indeed, there is every reason to believe that he had by that time already given expression to them, if not in writing, at least in vigorous, incisive speech. The encounter with Peter at Antioch referred to in the Epistle to the Galatians is not recorded in the Book of Acts, but its proper historical place, doubtless, falls within the period of Paul's stay in Antioch before setting out on the long mission tour, which had for its eventful result the extension of Christianity from Asia into Europe.³

¹ Galatians ii. 4.

² Such is the general opinion of critics. Paul, Silvanus, and Timothy are named together in the salutations. *Vide* Acts xviii. 5.

³ *Vide* Acts xv. 35, 36.

In that memorable interview, Paul for the first time, so far as we know, gave utterance to his distinctive conception of the Christian faith. In *Galatians* ii. 14-21 we have the Pauline Gospel *in nuce*; not the supposed primitive Paulinism of a yet undeveloped Christian consciousness, but the fully formulated Paulinism of the controversial letters, which contain nothing clearer, more definite, or more characteristic than is to be found in that remarkable utterance. But that speech to Peter was uttered many months before the Thessalonian Epistles were written.¹

If therefore we are to find in these Epistles the faint outlines of a rudimentary Pauline Gospel forming the Christian creed of the Apostle before he understood the implications of the faith, we must disregard the historical notices of *Acts*, and relegate their composition to a period antecedent to the rise of the dispute about circumcision and the meeting of the Jerusalem Conference.² The hypothesis of a primitive Paulinism escapes in that case from the control of fact and the hazard of authoritative contradiction. Not altogether indeed, even on that gratuitous supposition; for, from the statement Paul makes in his Epistle to the Galatians, that he did not meet with any of the apostles till three years after his conversion, it may very reasonably be argued that, even at that early period, his conception of Christianity was well defined. Such an inference harmonises with the aim of the statement. But of this more hereafter.

¹ The bearing of the above-mentioned facts on the question of a primitive Paulinism, supposed to be exhibited in the Epistles to the Thessalonians, is very forcibly brought out by Holsten. Vide *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, Vorwort, p. viii.

² So Ménégoz, who thinks the Epistles to the Thessalonians the most doubtful of all Paul's reputed writings, and that expressly on the ground that the views of the Gospel they present are so unlike what we find in the other Epistles. His idea is, that if they were really Paul's, they must have been written long before the others, at a time when Paul's particular tendency was not yet accentuated, and his system not yet in course of formation. Vide *Le Péché et la Rédemption d'après Saint Paul*, p. 4.

So far, then, as the earliest letters of Paul are concerned, there is no evidence to support the theory of a slow, gradual growth of his system of Christian thought. The phenomena they exhibit can neither prove nor be explained by that theory. But how then are they to be accounted for, as their existence cannot reasonably be denied, that the statements concerning the Gospel are very elementary, being evident to every attentive reader? The most likely suggestion is that the Epistles to the Thessalonian church show us the form in which Paul judged it fitting to present the Gospel to nascent Christian communities, when he had in view merely their immediate religious needs and capacities, and had no occasion to guard them against errors and misconceptions. This view sets Paul's character in an interesting light. It makes him appear a Paulinist, so to speak, against his will. He preached Paulinism, that which was most distinctive in his way of apprehending the faith, under compulsion; when free from the constraint of false and mischievous opinions, he taught the common faith of Christians in simple, untechnical language. This point is worth emphasizing at the commencement of this study, as helping us at once to appreciate the wisdom of the Apostle, and to put the proper value on the developed system of thought contained in his controversial Epistles. Why is it that the earliest Epistles are not to be reckoned among the sources of what we call Paulinism? Not because Paulinism was yet unborn, but because its author kept it in its proper place. Paul distinguished between religion and theology, between faith and knowledge; and while he spoke wisdom to them that were perfect, and theology to them that needed it and could make a good use of it, he practised reserve or self-restraint in speaking to babes in Christ, and in teaching them carefully avoided the use of abstruse ideas and technical terms.

This is the important inference referred to on a previous

page as deducible from the rudimentary Gospel contained in the earliest Epistles. And in view of that inference it becomes important to inform ourselves as to the precise character of Paul's rudimentary or missionary Gospel. It is what he deemed sufficient to salvation, though not to a full comprehension of Christianity. One cannot but desire to know what so great a master reckoned essential; and as his early letters are not available for the study of his developed theology, one may well be excused for lingering at the threshold to glance over their pages before entering on the more arduous task. The controversial Epistles are to be our text-book, but let us look for a little at those simple, child-like Epistles to the Thessalonian church as a kind of Christian Primer. We shall be none the worse qualified for mastering the text-book, and understanding its true meaning, that we carry the lessons of the Primer along with us.

The use of these Epistles as a Primer is justified by the writer's own way of expressing himself as to the purpose of his writing. Careful readers must have noticed the frequent recurrence of such phrases as "ye remember," "ye know." Baur utilises this feature as an argument against the genuineness, asking in effect: To what purpose this repetition of matters admitted to be familiar to the readers, and not of old date, but of quite recent occurrence?¹ The obvious reply is, that the writer wished to impress upon his readers the importance of the things alluded to, his aim in writing being not to give new instruction, but to make a fresh impression by recapitulating old instructions and by recalling to mind facts of didactic significance. Thus when he says, "Knowing, brethren, beloved of God, your election of God,"² his purpose is, by reminding them of their election to salvation, to suggest a valuable source of comfort and strengthening amid present tribulation. It is as

¹ Vide his *Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi*, ii. 95.

² 1 Thess. i. 4.

if he had said, Think of your election, and what it implies—a sovereign love of God which will not forsake you, a Divine purpose which shall surely be fulfilled. Again, when he says, “Yourselves know our entrance in unto you, that it was not in vain; but even after that we had suffered before, and were shamefully entreated, as ye know, at Philippi, we were bold in our God to speak unto you the Gospel of God amid much opposition,”¹ he manifestly means: as we did not allow our purpose in coming to Thessalonica to be frustrated by opposition, but resolutely preached the Gospel, refusing to be intimidated, so do ye resolve that persecution shall not make your reception of the Gospel vain, and persevere in faith in spite of all that evil men may do. When once more he reminds them of his way of life among them, alluding to his engaging in manual labour for his own support, to his nurse-like gentleness, to his perfect sincerity, to the purity and exemplariness of his whole behaviour, as things perfectly well known to them all,² he means to suggest that they should make his conduct, of which a vivid image remained in their minds, a pattern for their own. In a word, the Apostle treats the Christians of Thessalonica as children who need to hear the same things over and over again, not so much that they may know them, as that they may duly lay them to heart. And as he evidently does so in the instances cited, it is fair to assume that he does so throughout, and that all his statements, and in particular those referring to the Christian faith and life, are reminiscences and repetitions of what he had been accustomed to teach persons whom he regarded as spiritual children.

Let us then collect, in brief summary, the elements of Gospel truth contained in the few pages of this Christian Primer.

1. The name employed by Paul, as by Jesus Himself, to

¹ 1 ii, 1.

² 1 ii, 5-12.

denote the message of salvation is the Gospel, more definitely the *Gospel of God*, an expression used repeatedly in the first Epistle,¹ but occasionally replaced by such phrases as "our Gospel,"² "the Gospel of Christ,"³ "the Word of God."⁴

2. The substance of the message thus variously named, is the proclamation of a way of escape from "the wrath to come."⁵ Salvation is regarded chiefly from the *eschatological* point of view. Judging from the manner of expression pervading these Epistles, Paul, in addressing heathen audiences, was wont to speak of a coming Day of Judgment, when the Lord Jesus would be revealed from heaven to inflict punishment on them that know not God, and to tell them that by believing on Jesus they should escape the doom of the impenitent, and become partakers of all the joys of the kingdom of God.⁶ It may be noticed in passing that it is just after this fashion that Paul is represented in the Book of Acts as addressing the Athenians on Mars Hill.⁷ This is one of several instances in which the accounts of Paul's preaching given in Acts correspond with the idea of it suggested by the language of these early letters.

3. As the substance of the Gospel is contemplated from an eschatological point of view, so Christ, the author of salvation, is regarded under the same aspect. The great object of Christian trust appears not so much as Jesus the crucified, but rather as Jesus exalted into heaven, and about to come thence again for the destruction of sinners and the salvation of believers. The purchase of salvation by Christ's death falls into the background, and prominence is given to the final accomplishment of salvation by Christ glorified. This characteristic comes out in the description of the Thessalonian Christians as persons who have turned from idols to the living God,

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 2, 8, 9.

² 1 i. 5; 2 ii. 14.

³ 1 iii. 2; 2 i. 8.

⁴ 1 ii. 13.

⁵ 1 i. 10.

⁶ 2 i. 5-9.

⁷ Acts xvii. 30, 31.

and who now "wait for His Son from heaven."¹ Their relation to Christ is one of expectancy. Only once is Christ's death referred to as a means of salvation, and that in the most general terms. "For," writes the apostle in the text referred to, "God hath not appointed us to wrath, but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ, who died for us, that, whether we wake or sleep, we should live together with Him."² Here it is plainly implied that Christ's death took place for our salvation, salvation being here, as always in the two Epistles, regarded from the eschatological view-point; but there is no indication how Christ's death contributed to that end. If we were left with no other means of determining that question than these Epistles, we might conclude that Christ's death was saving, not by itself, but because it was followed by His resurrection. This might not un-naturally appear to be the import of another text referring to the death of Jesus: "If we believe that Jesus died and *rose again*, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him."³ It would not be right, even on the Primer-hypothesis, to infer that Paul had never made any more definite statements than these to the Thessalonian church, seeing that they both manifestly owe their form to the connection of thought in which they occur. The purpose in both cases is to comfort the members of the church in reference to deceased friends, also believers, by assuring them that death before the coming of the Lord would not, as they seem to have imagined, cut them off from a share in the joys of the kingdom. The comfort given is: Christ Himself died, and afterwards rose; and Christians who have died will also rise and partake in the bliss of those who shall be for ever with the Lord. Furthermore, Christ died in our behalf, for the very purpose that we might

¹ 1 Thess. i. 10.² 1 v. 10.³ 1 iv. 14.

obtain salvation; therefore it does not matter whether we sleep with the dead, or wake with the living at His coming. God's end in His Son's death will not fail; we shall all live together with Him. It may be assumed that over and above this the Apostle in his missionary preaching indicated at least in a general way that Christ's death had reference to *sin*. This assumption has good foundation in the summary which he gives of what he had been accustomed to teach the Corinthian church: "I delivered unto you first of all that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins, according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures."¹ It may be taken for granted that Paul, like all the other apostles—for he gives it as the common Gospel²—kept in view the points indicated in this summary, not only in Corinth, but wherever he went on his evangelising mission. Still it is remarkable that in these two letters to a young Christian community no express mention is made of the first article in the summary, especially if the design of the writer was to rehearse the leading points of instruction, to recall to the recollection of the readers what he had taught them when he was present with them. It implies this, at least, that the Apostle was not accustomed in his mission-addresses to enter with much fulness or exactness of statement into the doctrine of redemption by Christ's death. And here again there is a correspondence between what we infer from the Epistles, and what we learn from the book of *Acts*. The reports of Paul's mission-addresses in that book correspond closely to the summary of his preaching given by himself in his Epistle to the Corinthians. There

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3, 4.

² 1 Cor. xv. 11. "Whether it were I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed."

is, in the first place, careful detailed proof from Scripture of the truth of his leading positions. Then the points chiefly insisted on are just those indicated; Christ's death for sin, and His resurrection. The former, however, curiously enough, is the less prominent, being rather implied than plainly expressed. The words referring to this topic in the first and longest of the missionary speeches by Paul reported in *Acts* are these: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this Man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins; and by Him all that believe are justified from all things from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses."¹

4. In the sentence just quoted the word "justified"² occurs. No such word occurs in our two Epistles. But two other words are found, suggestive of cognate ideas, and sufficient to show that Paul's way of presenting the Gospel in mission sermons was the same in *essence* as it appears in the controversial Epistles, the only difference being that in the one we have the religious kernel, in the other the theological form. These words are *Faith* and *Grace*; trite words now, but great words then, and profoundly significant as to the character of the religion of which they were the watchwords. The terms are not used in any sharply defined dogmatic sense, but in a practical popular way. Christians are called believers—"you who believe."³ God is represented as the object of faith.⁴ Faith is not sharply opposed to works, but is

¹ Acts xiii. 38, 39. Hausrath thinks that the type of Paul's preaching is to be found in the Epistle to the Romans—that the apostle writes to that church which he had never visited as he preached to the churches he himself founded. *Vide Neutest. Zeitgeschichte*, ii. 514, 515. This opinion is based on prejudice against *Acts* as a non-reliable source of information as to Paul's preaching, not on a just view of the Epistle to the Romans, which, as we shall see, was a special writing meant to serve a special purpose.

² δίκαιωθῆναι, δικαιοῦσθαι.

³ 1 ii. 13.

⁴ 1 i. 8.

itself a work.¹ The word "grace" occurs less frequently, and chiefly in connection with sanctification. In the superscriptions the Apostle wishes for his readers, already believers, grace and peace, and in the superscription of the second Epistle these are represented as having their source in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ. The grace thence emanating is viewed as the means by which believers are enabled to glorify the name they bear, and are themselves fitted for future glory.² In both Epistles the writer closes as he begins, with the prayer that Christ's grace may be with his readers, as if that were all that was needful both for holiness and for happiness. It looks as if the writer knew something of the earthly life of Him who dwelt among men "full of grace," whose sermons were "words of grace," whose gracious love drew the sinful and sorrowful to Him, and sent them away into purity and peace.

5. By what titles does Paul name Jesus in these Primer Epistles? He calls Him *the Son of God*, and *the Lord*. The former title occurs in the text where the Thessalonians are described as having turned to the true God, and as waiting *for His Son* from heaven;³ a connection of thought which gives to the designation much significance. The honour and prerogative of the only true God are jealously guarded against the injury done to them by idolatrous worship, and yet in the same sentence in which this is virtually done Jesus is spoken of as a Son of the living and true God, and as one whose present abode is in heaven. What impression could such language produce on men who had been worshippers of gods many but that Jesus was divine? The other title, "Lord," points in the same direction of a high doctrine respecting the author of the faith. It is Paul's favourite title for Christ in his controversial Epistles, and it may

¹ 1 Thess. i. 3; 2 i. 11.

² 2 i. 12.

³ 1 i. 10.

be regarded as a result of this fact that the same title is frequently used in the Gospel of Luke (eminently Pauline in spirit) in places where the other Synoptists use the name Jesus. The designation occurs repeatedly in the two Epistles now under consideration, sometimes with the effect of identifying Jesus in the Christian consciousness with God; as *e.g.* in the expression, "the day of the Lord."¹ corresponding to the expression, "the day of Jehovah," in the Old Testament, and meaning the day when the *παρουσία* of the Lord Jesus Christ shall take place.

6. Mention is made in these Primer Epistles of the Holy Spirit, and in the specifically Pauline sense as the *Sanctifier*. Opportunity will occur hereafter for considering at length Paul's doctrine of the Spirit, and in connection therewith to advert to the distinction between the Spirit as transcendent, and the Spirit as immanent; as the former, the source of charisms or preternatural gifts, as the latter, the source of Christian sanctity. I simply remark here that it is from the immanent, ethical point of view that the Spirit is regarded in these Epistles, at least, chiefly, if not exclusively.² God gives His Holy Spirit to Christians,³ and for the purpose of *sanctification*.⁴ For while salvation, as already stated, is regarded from an eschatological point of view, present sanctification is strongly insisted [on as a necessary preparation for the future salvation. "Chosen unto salvation in or by sanctification," is the programme. The Apostle reminds his readers that when he was with them he had charged them to walk worthily of the God who had called them to His kingdom and glory.⁵ He now tells them that

¹ 1 v. 2; 2 ii. 2.

² The other aspect may be implied in the exhortation, "Quench not the Spirit," 1 v. 19.

³ 1 iv. 8.

⁴ 2 ii. 13.

⁵ 1 ii. 12.

God's will is their sanctification, that God had not called them to uncleanness, but to holiness,¹ and that he who practically forgets this is guilty of despising God, who gave the Spirit for this very end.² He sets before them as their great aim the sanctification of the whole man—spirit, soul, and body.³ They must cultivate purity; also unworldliness, so as to be free from all suspicion of covetousness, taking their teacher as their example. They must resolutely fight against every form of evil—drunkenness, impurity, greed, revenge, and all other sins of flesh and spirit, as Christian soldiers fully armed for the conflict, with faith and love for breastplate, and the hope of salvation for helmet.⁴ The interest of the writer in real Christian goodness is intense and unmistakable; and it inspires us with confidence that whatever Paulinism may mean, it will not be found to imply indifference to ethical ideals, and their embodiment in right conduct. We may expect to discover in the literature of Paulinism anything rather than a divorce between religion and morality; if, perchance, at any point the author's conception of Christianity may seem to compromise ethical interests, he will be sure to manifest a most delicate sensitiveness to the slightest appearance of so fatal a fault, and great solicitude to obviate misunderstanding.

Of that literature, consisting of the four great Epistles to the Galatian, Corinthian, and Roman churches, we must next take a rapid survey. But before doing this, it will be advantageous to form as definite a conception as possible of the nature and import of Paul's religious experience.

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ 1 iv. 7.

² 1 iv. 8.

³ 1 v. 23.

⁴ 1 v. 8.

THE PARABLE OF THE UNJUST STEWARD.

THE moral question connected with this parable has troubled some interpreters. The action of the steward was fraudulent. Can we press home any lesson of duty on such a basis? Can we in any sense take the steward as an example?

The sense of this difficulty, I conclude, gave rise to one interpretation, which may plead courage and ingenuity on its behalf. The steward was not fraudulent, *i.e.* not towards his lord. His fault was not in defrauding his master, but in overcharging systematically the tenants. Having been for many years, we may suppose, an extortionate steward, he suddenly becomes honest, reduces the tenants' rents to their fair price, in the hope that by the popularity of his action, he may secure a refuge in their houses when he is dismissed from his office.

Of course this theory of the steward's conduct is based on conjecture. There is nothing *primâ facie* to suggest that the fraud was mainly against the tenants. The probability is the other way. The spirit of the parable is against the theory; and, if we adopt it, it is difficult to give proper weight to the accusation that the steward had *wasted* his master's goods. Further, it is hard to imagine the human nature which would feel gratitude for such small and tardy mercies as the tenants received.

The ordinary interpretation sees in the steward the man who, being discovered, determines to make bad worse, with the view of winning the gratitude of the tenantry. The general application commends quickness and energy in the despatch of affairs, and the cultivation of a sort of business-like capacity among Christian people in their Christian work and duty.

May I venture to draw out another and somewhat differ-

ent scheme of interpretation? I present it for what it is worth. It is one which has grown upon my own mind, and which carries with it lessons which have special value for those who hold official place in the Church of Christ. I think also that it may carry a caution not wholly needless among all classes to-day.

The man is not a house-steward. His work includes that which usually falls to those whom we term agents. The system of rent payment indicated seems to be similar to that which prevails in some places (*e.g.* Northern Italy) at the present day. No fixed rent was charged; but the landlord and the tenant received stated proportions of the land produce. In the neighbourhood of Florence, one-half of the produce is credited to the landlord; the other half belongs to the farmer. The system has a measure of fairness, as the pressure of ill times and the profit of good times are shared by both persons concerned. The work of the steward or agent would be to make himself acquainted with the yield of the crops; and to see that a fair half, or other portion, was set aside for, or credited to, his master. Such is the system; and heedlessness or fraud on the part of the steward might well be accounted waste. If he failed to look after his master's interests or to gather in his master's share, he would be wasting his master's goods. The lands were held on the condition of such shares of produce being reserved for the landlord. Want of care, want of vigilance, want of promptness, would jeopardize the landlord's profits, and be accounted fairly a wasting of his goods.

Now, who were the stewards? If we ask the question of the disciples on another occasion,—“Lord, speakest Thou this parable unto us, or even unto all?” we must expect the answer, that it is a parable for all. But nevertheless, to clergymen and religious teachers, it has its special message. For, though all men, in so far as they have influence or trust reposed in them, are stewards, yet we cannot fail to re-

member that our Lord spoke of those who were entrusted with the religious care of others as stewards who brought forth things new and old, or who gave meat to the household in due season. The Apostle, too, accepted the image as having special fitness for those who exercised ministry in the Church of God. "Let a man so account of us . . . as stewards," etc. (1 Cor. iv. 1, 2). He spoke of fidelity as their special duty. In the Epistle to Titus the same image recurs.

The parable, then, however wide and universal its application may be, sounds with special and significant import in the ears of those who are put in trust with any sacred ministry among men. The steward surrenders to his own interests his master's property. He seeks favour and friendship among his lord's debtors at the expense of his master. When pressed by circumstances, he sacrifices not only his own trust and his own honour, but his master's rights for the sake of avoiding the hard necessity of toil and poverty. There is a message and a warning for the ministers of God here.

Now, who were these in our Lord's day? Who were the stewards of such things when Christ spoke the parable?

The Scribes and Pharisees sat in Moses' seat. The religious power of the day was wielded by Sadducee, Pharisee, Scribe, and Rabbi. At their door lay the duty to be faithful and to give meat to God's household in due season. We need not pause here. These men proved faithless in their high trust. The weightier matters of the law had been forgotten. Moral matters were set aside. Trifles were regarded as of importance. The mint, the anise, and the cummin were all important. The official spirit obtained all that priest and Levite needed. The tax, the tribute, the ceremonial which glorified the temple service and enriched the treasury were of the utmost importance. Judg-

ment, mercy, and the love of God—God's share in the religious life of the people—were disregarded.

Now, the action of the steward in the parable illustrates the conduct of those who are driven to desperate shifts to protect their own interests. In such cases expediency wins, and principle is set aside.

The action of Rulers and Pharisees in our Lord's day exemplify the same. It was an age of hollow compromises, and immoral expedients. The fear of doing wrong was not before their eyes; but the fear of losing worldly advantages was always with them. The reason for dealing with a case was expressed in the language of this fear: "If we let Him thus alone, . . . the Romans shall come and take away our place and nation." Caiaphas' saying embodied the spirit of their policy. It is expedient that one man should die for the nation. Right and wrong, justice and integrity, have no place. To do righteousness, and to dare the rest, was not a maxim among such men. The yield of the human heart to God in truthful thinking and loving action was never considered. Those which are God's corn and oil were kept back from their lawful owner. To surrender worldly advantages, prestige, honour, wealth, position, for the paltry sake of truth and mercy seemed outrageous extravagance. They knew better how to balance conflicting claims of heaven and earth. So when Christ, having spoken this parable, said, "Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," the Pharisees who were covetous derided Him.

Their derision revealed the hardening of their moral nature, which led to the supreme sacrifice of the Divine life which was among them. Christ, who was the bread of life indeed; Christ, whose grace shed the oil of gladness and holiness among men, was sacrificed by the men to whom self-interest was the chief good, and who had forgotten the rights of God in their eagerness to preserve their own.

It is not difficult to see the bearing of all this on modern life.

Every man is a steward of some power and influence. That power and influence is God's property. To use it so that the agent may gain, and the owner may lose, is to waste the Great Master's goods. Every man who uses his capacities and opportunities only for self is false to his stewardship. If he strains the sense of inward truthfulness, he tampers with the just ownership of that which is the corn of life. If he fails in sincerity, he sacrifices its oil.

Teachers of religion, the prophets of their age, have so sinned when they prophesied smooth things, having men's persons in admiration because of advantage. They have robbed their Lord of the portion which was His when, for popularity's sake, they have lowered the demands of God upon man's allegiance and life. They have been fraudulent towards heaven when they have so spoken or acted as to lead men to think that freedom to sin might be connived at so long as the coffers of the Church were full, and her altars splendidly sustained. It is not difficult, alas! to lower the price of truth. Comfortable teaching, which makes formal or emotional conformity a substitute for reality and moral integrity in matters of faith, is one method of bidding the Lord's debtor to sit down quickly and write his obligations as fifty instead of a hundred.

It is not wise to press details too far; but we may remind ourselves that the oil and the corn are familiar images in Scripture. The oil is that which makes the lamps to glow with light. It is the influence of that Holy Spirit of Love without which life has no real, abiding brightness. St. Augustine's interpretation of the parable of the Ten Virgins will come to our minds. Corn is the source of strength in life: it is bread which strengtheneth man's heart. Where love is wanting, and where truth fails, there God is defrauded. Take heed to thyself and to the doctrine, was

the Apostle's caution. Let the grace as well as the truth be yours. Let the oil as well as the corn be in full measure yielded up to God. In the ministry of our powers we must be salt as well as light. If we defraud truth to suit the popular taste, or if we by worldliness of demeanour lead men to think less of the imperious claim of a consecrated life, we are unfaithful in our stewardship. We tamper with the corn and the oil. The truth which makes men free, and the enlightening unction of the Holy One, become disregarded, and the Lord of Life is defrauded of the fruits of human life.

The lesson of the parable, therefore, becomes a caution against that shrewd and yet unscrupulous spirit which seeks self-interest at the cost of truth and principle.

There was one among the disciples, whose case exactly fitted the story. The character of Judas Iscariot is, I think, misunderstood. He was not so foolish and stupid a man as to be tempted by a paltry bribe of thirty pieces of silver when his position gave him the handling of much larger sums of money (see S. John xii. 6). Neither was he the subtle reader of wish and character such as philosophical apologists like De Quincey and Archbishop Whately would make him. He was a clever and self-interested schemer. There was a possibility, and a prospect, that our Lord would win the triumph of a temporal Messiah. It was politic therefore to be in a position to reap the advantages of such a triumph. But there was another contingency. It was possible that the prophet of Galilee should prove a disappointment, as other fancied Messiahs had done. With such a failure, Judas' dreams of future advancement and wealth would disappear. As time goes on, the chances of such a failure seem to be more apparent. His leader does not act as other leaders of popular movements. He shrinks back from the people's enthusiasm; He disappoints—He offends them; money

which might be used to conciliate the populace is allowed to be wasted. To the eye of Judas, it seems as though the position he had won and the hopes he had cherished are likely to be swept away. He feels too that he himself may possibly be suspected. His stewardship in one way or another may be taken away. It is the part of prudence to secure his retreat. It is essential to his self-interests that he should have the door of welcome open to him on the other side. Hence he negotiates with the party in authority. He agrees to sacrifice truth and principle for the sake of advantage. He puts his Master's foes in the way of gaining what they sought. From a worldly point of view it is an adroit scheme; for he has put the other side under an obligation, and whatever happens he has secured their favour. He is the unfaithful steward. He is the type of those who never were alive to the higher life of truth, loyalty, devotion and honour; but he goes beyond the timid selfishness of the souls whom Dante pictured; for he does not shrink from the sacrifice of life and honour so long as he can preserve his own interests. He is the type of those who for self's sake will allow any wrong or any suffering to go on, and who are content for any man or set of men to endure death or dishonour, or suffer spiritual loss rather than to forego their own safety or advantage.

The next question which presents itself is, Does such policy answer? If I understand aright our Lord's comments on the parable, He answers this question with the most emphatic negative. The attempt to serve God and Mammon is doomed to failure. Ye cannot serve God and Mammon. It is vain to try and stand well with the world and well with God. There may be times when the interests of the world coincide with the interests of righteousness; but the attempt to make both coincide is a mistake, which will be overtaken by shameful failure. Faithfulness,

down to the smallest matter of intellectual honesty and personal conscience, is essential to the mastery of those unseen conditions of life which prepare men for the possession of the true riches. Fidelity to the trust which is given us in this life leads to the throne and sovereignty over self which is an eternal inheritance. Life is an education towards true self-possession. To make self the centre now is to lose the inheritance of the true self hereafter. If ye have not been faithful in that which is another man's, who shall give you that which is your own? (S. Luke xvi. 12).

What then of the difficult verse (*v.* 9)? "Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness, that when ye fail (or when it shall fail) they may receive you into everlasting habitations." Are we to read these words as a counsel of the prudent use of this world's wealth? Are they not, in the light of the story, ironical? The policy which the faithless steward adopted did answer. He secured the open doors of welcome of the tenants; but such dextrous policy can never win open doors in the everlasting habitations. To tamper with a trust, and to suffer ourselves or others to think that we can defraud the Lord of all of one whit of His claim over us, may be followed by the smiles and patronage of those who dwell in sumptuous earthly mansions; but the heavenly gates are not so won. Let a man try it, and make friends out of the mammon of unrighteousness, what can such friends avail when the mansions are the eternal mansions of the imperishable and incorruptible righteousness of God?

Was not this the experience of Judas? He sought to make friends on a worldly basis. He hoped that a door of refuge would be opened to him whatever might happen. But the hour came when all his clever plotting was found vain. His self-seeking policy secured nothing. He found himself at last, as all self-seeking souls must find them-

selves, alone, with the doors of life closed on all sides against him. His miserable divided mind and self-centred soul could see no door of heaven opening to him. All the sagacity and adroitness had ended in a vain and fruitless shame. He saw no light of spiritual opportunity. Finding earth's doors and heaven's doors closed against him, he sought to hide away behind the gate of death the life which was such a miserable failure. His fate is the warning against the chimerical theory that the favour of men, won by concession of principle, can secure any permanent refuge in the time of direct and loneliest necessity. It is the lesson against endeavouring to win on both sides—on the spiritual and on the temporal.

“Ye cannot serve God and mammon.”

W. B. RIFON.

THE DIFFICULT WORDS OF CHRIST.

1. THE CHILDREN AT PLAY.

MATT. XI. 16-19.¹

THIS passage is a criticism passed by Christ upon the generation to which He belonged, in respect of their treatment of the Baptist and Himself.

Characteristically He has embodied His rebuke in a figure of speech. It is also characteristic that the image is borrowed from common life. He took the commonest incidents of everyday life, such as the mending of the rent in an old garment or the lighting of the household lamp,

¹ “But whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children sitting in the markets, and calling unto their fellows, and saying, We have piped unto you, and ye have not danced; we have mourned unto you, and ye have not lamented. For John came neither eating nor drinking, and they say, He hath a devil. The Son of man came eating and drinking, and they say, Behold a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners. But wisdom is justified of her children.”

and made them into pictures of immortal truth. It is still further characteristic that this figure is borrowed from the children's world. This was a world in which He was quite at home, and He observed its scenes with a sympathetic and retentive eye.

The scene here described is apparently a game. He had noticed the children in the market, playing first at a marriage, when one piped and the others danced about him, and then at a funeral, when one beat his breast, as if in terrible distress, and the rest followed mourning. The picture remained in His mind, and now, on an important occasion, it becomes the vehicle of His doctrine.

There is a difficulty, however, in construing the figure. Who are represented by the children who complain to their companions?¹ The old view (Chrysostom, Calvin and many) was that they were Jesus and the Baptist; but of late the foremost exegetes (Lange, Meyer, Weiss, Holtzmann, Bruce; not Stier or Godet) maintain that they must be the Jews.² Jesus says: "Whereunto shall I liken this generation? It is like unto children, . . . saying, We have piped unto you," etc. Distinctly, it is maintained, the speakers are the generation—that is, the contemporaries—of John and Jesus.³

The question is whether, when Jesus begins a comparison by saying that a certain thing is like another, of which a picture follows, it must be the first object mentioned in the picture that corresponds to the subject of the sentence. A good many of Christ's sayings begin with these very words: So-and-so is like such-and-such: but an examination of

¹ According to different readings, *ἑταίροις* or *ἐτέροις*.

² If this view is to be taken, I would suggest that the two halves of the complaint be attributed to Sadducees and Pharisees respectively.

³ Meyer alleges two other reasons—(1) the three *λέγουσιν*, whose subjects must correspond; but this is only the same argument in another form; and (2) the order of the clauses of the complaint, which would have been reversed had John and Jesus been intended.

them does not bear out this literalist view. For instance : "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a man who sowed good seed in his field": it is not really to the man, but to the field that the kingdom is compared. Still more evidently, when He commences, "The kingdom of heaven is like unto ten virgins," the strictly literal interpretation cannot be pressed. When Jesus says that one thing is like another, He is not laying down the image on the top of the thing which it is to illustrate in such a way that the two must correspond point by point: the phrase "it is like" is rather a link by which the thing to be illustrated is loosely connected with the illustration, which is then developed as a picture with perfect freedom.

When we look into the substance of the comparison, this seems still more probable. The new view represents the contemporaries of John and Christ as proposing to them to start with them first on one line of action and then on another, as the children proposed to their fellows to begin playing first at one game and then at another; and the fault supposed to be attributed to them is a spirit of childish fickleness and changeableness. But is this at all an accurate account of the relative positions of these two and their contemporaries? What proposals for new action did their contemporaries make to them? Were not John and Jesus the innovators, who proposed the new departures, but could not get their contemporaries to join? Besides, is it historical to say that fickleness and an excessive disposition to change were the characteristics of the age of Jesus? Quite the contrary is the case. There have been generations when great religious teachers have had to resist such tendencies of the public mind, and call their contemporaries to stand in the old paths. Jeremiah's, for instance, was such a time. But in the age of Christ the genius of the nation, against which its prophets had to contend, was a conservatism wedded to old customs and traditions. The

Baptist and Jesus were both originators of great forward movements, which required men to leave old tenets behind and move on into new regions by paths unknown; but they could not rouse the age out of its indifference and self-satisfaction.

It is only a sentimental reason against the new construction: yet it may not on this account be without weight: that it takes all the sunshine out of the picture of child life which the illustration presents. In the old way of looking at it, we have a street or a playground with children of diverse dispositions—some bright and sanguine, ready to propose what would supply occupation and entertainment for all; others uninterested and lethargic, always finding fault and frustrating what is proposed. And such a playground, I venture to say, corresponds with reality. But the new construction sees nothing in the playground but fickleness, sulkiness and disorder. In Professor Bruce's very able statement of it, for example, in his *Parables*, there is not a gleam of sunshine left. Is this the picture of the children's world likely to have come from the brush of Christ?

In short, by sticking to the old way of construing the parable, there is nothing to lose, because all that is really brought out by the new is included; and there is everything to gain.

When we turn from the illustration to the thing illustrated, there is not much difference of opinion as to the truth enforced.

Christ gives clearly the reasons why John and He were not successful; or rather, He gives the reasons which their contemporaries alleged for deserting them. For a time John enjoyed great popularity and success. The whole country went out to him, and thousands were baptized. His preaching shook the minds of men, and it looked as if

they were so deeply moved that anything might be done with them. Soon, however, enthusiasm died down; the tide of the national life returned to its wonted channels; and the Baptist was neglected. People had to assign a reason for their indifference, and they discovered it in the preacher's manner of life. He came neither eating nor drinking; he was an ascetic. But he carried things too far. He is a little wrong in the mind, they said—"He hath a devil." And so they turned away from him, having by the help of this reasoning restored their self-satisfaction. Jesus, in His turn, had a year of popularity. For a time His sunny influence moved the general mind even more strongly than the stormy attack of John had done. The flute-note of love in His preaching thrilled even those who had not been stirred by the thunder of the law. From every quarter of the land hearers flocked to Him, and He moved in a perpetual crowd. But soon, in His case also, the tide ebbed. And again a reason was found. Jesus came eating and drinking;¹ He was not an ascetic like John, but lived as other men; He availed Himself of the social gatherings of ordinary life to extend His influence and find an audience for His message; He did not even disdain, on such occasions, the company of publicans and sinners. Here was something to lay hold of and object to; and, as it went from mouth to mouth, it swelled in its progress, till He became a man gluttonous, and a winebibber, a friend of publicans and sinners.

Thus their reasons for forsaking the two prophets contradicted one another. Had they been in earnest in their objection to John—that they were seeking a bright and cheerful form of religion—then they would have welcomed Jesus; and, had they been in earnest in their objections to

¹ "Hunc locum observent qui summam perfectionis statuunt in externa vitæ austeritate; nam secundum hanc regulam præstantior esset Joannes Filio Dei."
—CALVIN.

Jesus, they would have been satisfied with John. But this is always the way with those who are not in earnest: they never lack a reason, though they may have to give opposite ones at different times. As someone has quaintly said, in summer it is too hot, and in winter it is too cold. The law is too harsh, and the gospel too soft. Religion is too rigid and unbending to-day, and too hysterical to-morrow. Nowhere is this contradictoriness more common than in the region of anti-religious speculation. Here the Bible is objected to because it narrates so uncompromisingly the lapses of its heroes, there because it makes their sainthood too immaculate (Kögel). To-day Christ is unacceptable because Scripture makes Him a God, to-morrow it is discovered that the record can be so interpreted as to make Him not even a good man. The phases of unbelief change from year to year; and yet there is never wanting some reason for disbelieving the Gospel.

Ostensibly it was not to the message of either John or Jesus that objection was taken, but, in each case, to something in the message-bearer. It was John's asceticism apparently that was complained of, and Christ's free-living. This also is characteristic of the rejectors of the Gospel in every age. They do not say to others, they do not even confess to themselves, that it is religion itself they dislike. They fix on some external and accidental thing connected with it, to which objection can be taken, and make this a shield with which to parry the attack on the conscience and the life. Very often it is something in the conduct of professors of religion: they are too strict and solemn like John, or they are too happy and enthusiastic like Jesus. The alleged inconsistencies of Christians are deemed a sufficient reason for living a life of sin; as if the existence of some unworthy Christians were not rather a reason why those who see their defects should themselves come forward with a better illustration of Christianity. The deficiencies

of the preachers of the Gospel supply numberless excuses. One is too learned, another not learned enough; one is too worldly, another too other-worldly; one is too haughty, another too familiar; and so on without end.

But the contemporaries of John and Jesus, though so ready with reasons, did not give the real reason. The reasons they gave were only excuses. The real reason was that they were afraid of John's glittering axe "Repent" (Kögel), and of Christ's winnowing-fan, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." That was the real reason, and it will be the real reason to the end of the chapter.

Though the mission of the Baptist and of Jesus was a failure, as far as their contemporaries were concerned, it was not entirely a failure even among them. This is the last idea in this passage; but the words in which it is expressed are difficult—"And¹ wisdom is justified² of her children."

The expression is a curious one; for one naturally asks why anything so far above suspicion as wisdom should require to be justified, and how it can be justified. The sense seems to be that suspicion is cast upon wisdom when men condemn as unwise what it has done, as the contemporaries of John and Jesus condemned their methods; but, in such circumstances, it may be said to be justified by other men, when they condemn this condemnation and express their appreciation of wisdom's ways. In truth, all men are at all times practically either condemning or justifying wisdom according as they ignore or follow the path which it has prescribed for their own life.

Some suppose that Christ was speaking ironically; as if, after quoting the remarks of His contemporaries, He had

¹ Καί, with great slowness and emphasis, = *καίτοι*.

² Ἐδικαιώθη, gnomic aorist.

said, "These are wisdom's children; and this is all they know of her ways"! Others have taken the words to mean "in spite of her children";¹ as if He had said, "Let her children misunderstand her as they may, yet time and events² always have justified, and always will justify wisdom."

But what Jesus really meant is made plain by the words with which this passage is introduced in St. Luke: "And all the people that heard him (*i.e.* John) and the publicans justified God, being baptized with the baptism of John. But the Pharisees and lawyers rejected the counsel of God against themselves, not being baptized of him."³ The counsel of God, which is just another name for the wisdom of God, was displayed in the mission and the preaching of John; but the Pharisees rejected it; they did so practically by not submitting to the rite to which it summoned them. But the common people and the publicans, by submitting to baptism, justified God, or God's wisdom.

These, then, are the children of wisdom,⁴ by whom she is justified. They are the same as are designated in words which occur a little later in the same discourse to which this passage belongs—ver. 25: "At that time Jesus answered and said, I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes." Though the great mass of their generation, and especially the learned and influential, rejected John and Jesus, yet there were those who discerned in them messengers of Heaven and received them as gifts which the divine wisdom had

¹ The proposition is peculiar—*ἀπό*, *apart from* her children: she is justified from their condemnation. But *ἀπό* may be used for *ὕπό*; cf. Acts ii. 22.

² Here may be mentioned the reading *ἔργων*, adopted in the Revised Version and by Westcott and Hort, who, however, have *τέκνων* in St. Luke. It seems to have arisen through a substitution of *τέχνων* for *τέκνων*.

³ It is doubtful whether these are words of Jesus or of the evangelist. I incline to the former view.

⁴ Cf. Ecclesiasticus iv. 11: "Wisdom exalteth her children, and layeth hold of them that seek her."

sent. Therefore they lent an attentive ear to their messages and enriched themselves with the influences which they brought. They were not disappointed: their faith was justified, and they in turn justified God.¹

Now, what distinguished them from others? Why did they receive John and Christ, while others rejected them? Jesus says they were the children of wisdom.² They were those in whom the wisdom of God in the old dispensation and the Old Testament had done its work. They were chastened and expectant. Therefore, when the divine wisdom appeared in a new form, they submitted themselves to its leading. They went down not only into the water of Jordan, on the hand of John, but into the valley of humiliation and penitence. Instead of criticising the preacher, they absorbed the sermon, and allowed it to do its work in their heart. Then, when yet another manifestation of the divine wisdom appeared, they were ready to receive also what He brought. Knowing, through John's ministry, what sin was, they were able to appreciate the great announcement of the new dispensation, "Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

JAMES STALKER.

¹ "All her children," says St. Luke; on which Calvin remarks characteristically: "Ergo, quamlibet multi apostatæ a Dei ecclesia desciscant, semper tamen apud omnes electos, qui vere sunt ex grege, persistet Evangelii fides."

² Compare Christ's saying to Pilate: "Every one that is of the truth (*i.e.* a son of truth) heareth My voice."

EXEGETIC STUDIES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

I.

I HAVE hesitated to comply with the request to write these papers, lest thoughts so simple as these should be too unlearned, too little recondite, for readers of THE EXPOSITOR. Yet it may be good for us all sometimes to remind ourselves of very elementary truths, which are indeed so far from being beneath our notice that they are *inexhaustible* in their depth and significance. "Wisdom," as the wise poet reminds us,

"Is oftentimes nearer when we stoop,
Than when we soar."

A great theologian, in his old age, said that the truths by which he supported his soul's life were not those of the *Summa Theologiæ*, but those of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments. "There are," said Coleridge, "some truths, and those of all others the most awful and interesting, which are too often considered as so true that they lose all the power of truth, and lie bedridden in the dormitory of the soul, side by side with the most despised and exploded errors."

May I be pardoned if I appear to begin far back from my immediate subject? In no other way can I re-brighten the forgotten truth which long familiarity has so grievously dulled, and tarnished, for us—the inexpressible importance of trying to grasp the full meaning of the Lord's Prayer?

In meditating on the Lord's Prayer we are meditating on a part of Christ's teaching which is, of all others, of the most consummate and daily significance for our spiritual being. For,

1. We stand, each one of us, high and low, rich and

poor, learned and unlearned, one with another, by the deep and rushing flood of life. With a roar as of Niagara, it is ever plunging into the vast unknown abyss. At every ticking of the clock some fifty human souls are streaming into eternity, and each soul makes scarcely a ripple on the waters as it drops through this bridge of threescore and ten arches into "the rolling waters of that prodigious tide." How are we to span that mighty chasm, which rolls through the unknown darkness on either bank, and of which we see so little except the momentary gleaming of its foam?

i. Beginning with what we *do* know, we "believe in the soul and are very sure of God." There may be, all around us, a limitless and unfathomable flood of mystery. *Omnia exeunt in mysterium*. "What we know is little, what we are ignorant of is immense." It is no clergyman, it is Mr. Herbert Spencer, who says that "The man of science realises with vividness the utter incomprehensibility of the simplest fact considered in itself. He, more than any other man, truly knows that, in its ultimate essence, nothing can be known."

If we could know the inmost essence of anything, we might get to understand the essential secret of everything.

"Flower in the crannied wall,
I pluck you out of the crannies,
Hold you there, root and all, in my hand;
Little flower, but if I could understand
What you are, root and all, and all in all,
I should know what God and man is."

Nevertheless, amid all our ignorance, we know first of all that though we *have* bodies we *are* spirits, and that we did not make ourselves. "We believe," as Browning sang, "in the soul, and are very sure of God."

ii. Since then "it is He that hath made us, and not we ourselves," it follows on the very idea of God that "we are

His people and the sheep of His pasture." Since it is God who made the soul, there must be some relation between the soul and God. What is that relation? It may be expressed in the one word Duty. I *think*, therefore I am: I am, therefore I *ought*, I can, I will. "Oh, Duty," said Kant, "oh, wondrous power, that workest rather by insinuation, flattery, and threat, but merely by holding up the naked law in the soul, extortest for thyself reverence, if not always obedience, oh, thou before whom all appetites are dumb, however secretly they may rebel, whence is thine origin?" That categoric imperative is one of the ultimate facts of our consciousness, upon which we ought to build—as on the granite bases of the world—the superstructure of our lives, and all our aims. To Kant's question, "What is thine origin?" there can be but one answer, "Thine origin is God."

iii. But what are the contents of the Law of Duty? The answer is not infinitely complicated as the religionism and the theology of man have made it, but infinitely simple. It is given in the Voice from Sinai; it is comprehended in the Ten Commandments as Christ expanded and explained them. "He hath shewn thee, O man, what is good," said the Prophet Micah, "and what doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?" "That supreme and sacred Majesty," said Lactantius, in a sentence which deserves to be written in letters of gold, "requires of us nothing save innocence alone." Tertullian gave the whole secret of the stupendous victory of Christianity in its "unresistible weakness," when he wrote in challenge to the Pagan world, *Nos soli innocentes sumus*.

iv. And what Duty requires of us no man can have any doubt, because God has sent His great angel of Conscience to be ever with us, and to take us by the hand. If any one ask, "What is Conscience?" the question has been

rightly answered long ago by many of the world's greatest thinkers. "It is," says Dante, "the strong supporter who buckles his breastplate on those who fearlessly do their duty." "It is," says Shakespeare, "the blushing shamefast spirit which mutinies in a man's bosom." "It is," says Milton, "God's secretary within us." "It is," says John Smith, "a domestical chaplain within us which preaches to us the sermon over again." Bishop Butler defined it as being "the principle in man by which he approves or disapproves of his heart, temper and actions." Cardinal Newman calls it "the primitive vicegerent of God within us, a prophet in its informations, a monarch in its peremptoriness, a priest in its sanctions and anathemas." And perhaps, as in that beautiful reminiscence, which Theodore Parker has given us of the day when he first awoke to the consciousness of conscience, we may best call it "*The voice of God in the heart of man.*"

v. So far then we have gained the means by which we may bridge the dark and fathomless abyss of life which rolls between that which may seem to us to be the darkness and the darkness; and by these means we may discover that the unknown past from which we came, and the unknown future to which we go, are, in reality, not banks of darkness, but great deeps of divine and infinite light.

vi. How *did* they bridge the roaring flood of the Niagara, just at the point where it plunges into that awful cataract?

"They say," writes an American clergyman, "that a tiny kite flew over the chasm, and fell with its silken thread on the other side. The chasm was spanned by a thread! But the thread was used to pull over a cord, and the cord a rope, and the rope a chain, and the chain a cable, and so was built the bridge of steel, over whose steadfast span the massive trains thunder as they come and go. Thus may it be with the most attenuated thread of

honest, earnest faith. What possibilities, what destinies hang upon it! Ah, it may be lightly snapped asunder! But place it in the hands of God with the prayer, 'Lord, I believe, help Thou my unbelief,' and the thread may become a rope, and the rope a chain, and the chain a bridge, over the vast abyss."

vii. Now I maintain that when we start with the conviction that we have souls: that the soul is not the body, but a different and an immaterial entity; that God made us; that God stands in immediate relation to the souls which He has made; that this relation is expressed by the Law of Duty; that the duty is taught us by our Conscience, which is God's voice within us; then, seeing that we have wounded our conscience, violated our duty, disobeyed the voice of God, injured and ruined our souls and our whole being, into which God breathed the breath of life, when we are deeply convinced of all this, it becomes *not difficult to believe, but impossible not to believe* that, as by God's miracle we have been created, so by God's miracle we should be redeemed. The broken Law becomes the attendant-slave (*παιδαγωγός*) to lead our sin-burdened souls to Christ. God would be to us no God if He were not love. Knowing that He is love, we know that He would not leave us, with the curse of our misused free-will, to the deathful menace of the law. Every fact of our being prepares us for the revelation of the Gospel, that herein "God commendeth His own love towards us, in that, while we were yet sinners, Christ died for the ungodly" (Rom. v. 6, 8). So are we led—

"To that unknown, obscure, sequestered place,
Where God unmake but to *remake* the soul
He else made first in vain —which must not be."

II.

Yet neither law nor gospel would have been of any avail to us had we been vouchsafed no means of constant communication with God. The first possibility of such communication is by prayer. Prayer in due time may ride, as on the wings of eagles, into rapture, into passive ecstasy, into the beatific vision; and—

“ In those high hours
Of visitation from the living God,
Thought *is* not; in enjoyment it expires.”

This may never come to us on earth, but *prayer* is always ours. Christ has come to deliver us from the curse of the Law; He offers us forgiveness for past sins, strength for future faithfulness; but one chief means by which alone we can avail ourselves of both is prayer. That we should be allowed to pray—that free, unimpeded, immediate access to God should thus be given us in Christ—is the most priceless boon bestowed upon our suffering humanity. It is the glory of life that Christ Himself encourages us to pray.

2. It is needless, here at any rate, to waste time over the theoretic and philosophic difficulties which sceptics have urged against prayer. Prayer, they say, is an intrinsic absurdity. It is a childish attempt to interfere with inevitable laws and unalterable sequences. It is an insult to All-wisdom and Omnipotence. It arises from a childish terror, which attempts to secure that things shall not be as they are. It is a fetish-worshipping endeavour to bring about the impossible, and to interfere with the certainty that two and two must ever make four. Such reasonings may sound very formidable, but they are utterly inoperative. We stride through them as through so many threads of gossamer. When we have heard them all, even if we feel ourselves incapable of giving an abstract answer to

them all, we kneel down with as much confidence in God as before, and it may be with a more passionate conviction than before, and cry, "God be merciful to me, the sinner." The Divine instincts and the imperious needs of humanity tear the "difficulties" of sceptics to shreds, and fling them to the winds. God's unmistakable whisper within us *bids* us make our requests known unto Him. Yes, and many a time, the sceptic himself, when he has been plunged into the waves and storms of calamity, belies all his own negations and pours out prayers, which he cannot help, to the God in whom he refuses to believe. It is told of a certain notable historic prisoner that, after arguing against the existence of God, the moment he was left alone he was heard to fling himself on his knees in his prison-cell in a passion of entreaty; and that on the scaffold he poured out the desolate and agonised supplication, "O God, if there be a God, save my soul if I have a soul!"

3. Nor shall we be content with pleading in support of the habit of prayer its unquestionable reflex benefits. Prayer, as St. Augustine says, "brightens the heart, and purges it for the acceptance of the gifts of heaven." Prayer strengthens the faith from which it springs; it gives to hope its *ἀποκαρδοκία*, the stretching out of the neck, the standing on tiptoe in earnest expectation; it kindles love to a purer and brighter flame. Yes; but more than this,—

"Prayer moves the arm of Him who moves the world."

We are not in the least shaken by being told that this is miraculous, that it is supernatural. Of course it is. We live, and move, and have our being in the region of the supernatural. We are encompassed on all sides by daily, hourly, momentary miracles; there is nothing else but miracle all around us. We are miracles ourselves. It is only in the atmosphere of the supernatural that the spiritual can draw vital air.

III.

If we have realised these truths we are at last in a condition to realise the stupendous importance of the fact that Christ should Himself have taught us how to pray. It means nothing less than this: that *God has taught us how to address God*; that divine lips have taught us in what manner, and even with what words, to approach and to appeal to the divine.

In comparison with such teaching must not all else sink into comparative insignificance? If God has thus taught us how to pray to God, what need have we greatly to worry ourselves, or the pure, simple souls of God's children, with all the intolerable and interminable prolixities of party opinionativeness, and controversial dogmatism? What can it avail to magnify the non-essential; to alter the whole perspective of the New Testament; to reintroduce post-exilic Levitism into the gospel simplicity; to substitute the huddle of mediæval corruptions for the simplicity of gospel truths; to make more of Pharisaic scrupulosities than of the elementary Christian graces? What need have we of arrogant pretensions and infinitesimal nullities, when God has taught us the utter simplicity of all His essential requirements—the utter simplicity with which we may draw nigh, not with our lips only but with our hearts, to God?

IV.

If the Lord's Prayer be of so Divine an origin, it must justify its origin by its absolute perfectness, its flawless inspiration, its all-comprehensive adaptability to every need. That it does all this, I will try to show hereafter. I will now very briefly point out one or two initial elements of its priceless and exemplary revelation.

i. First, it is most observable, that Christ endeavoured

to make Prayer as infinitely *easy* to us as it is infinitely blessed. It is by no means so with other religions, even with some of the least false religions of the world. They surround prayer with all kinds of mechanical difficulties and restrictions, or they even tend to relegate it altogether into the hands of a caste. Even "the statutes which were not good" and "ordinances whereby a man cannot live" of later Levitism, hedged prayer around with so many ceremonial prescriptions, that the plain, unlearned man could hardly tell when or how to pray, without committing some mechanical sin in the very act of doing so. Some fringe, or some phylactery, or some ablution might be wrong, and everything would be vitiated; Christianity itself, when corrupted into a self-asserting and exclusive sacerdotalism, offers its public prayers in a tongue not understood of the people; turns it into a penance of mechanism; relegates to an usurping class the efficacy of its most supposed-effective exercises. Not so Christ! He made the access to prayer, so far as all external obstructions are concerned, incredibly easy. He allowed neither priest, nor gifts, nor sacrifices, nor formality, nor functions, nor saints, nor any human intercessor, nor Gerizim, nor Jerusalem, nor ceremonies, nor rubrics, to thrust themselves, or to be thrust, to the most trivial extent, between the soul and God. Every time, every place, every posture, it has been truly said, is easy. "Talent is not needful. Eloquence is out of place. Dignity is no recommendation. Our want is our eloquence, our misery our recommendation. Thought is quick as lightning, and quick as lightning can it multiply effectual prayers. The whole function is simply this—a child, a wandering child, comes to its Father, and pleads for forgiveness and for help."

ii. And with this simplicity Christ taught the ordinary desirableness of brevity.

When, in the Sermon on the Mount, Christ said, "After

this manner pray ye," He gave warnings against two parasitic destructions of prayer,—*βαττολογία* and *πολυλογία*—babbling iteration and wearisome formality, He gave an example of directness and brevity.

There are no vain repetitions in the Lord's Prayer, such as marked the prayers of the heathen. The Hindoo Fakir will spend the whole day in repeating the name of his god—Brahmah, Brahmah, Brahmah, or Krishna, Krishna, Krishna. The Buddhist Bonze thinks that there is efficacy in the endless repetition of his mystic formula, OM MANI PADME HUM. The Mussulman will interlard the interminable intricacies of his most cheating bargain with incessant asseverations that "God is merciful" and "God is great." The ignorant Romanist mumbles by the hour together his Aves, and his Paters, dropping a bead of his rosary with every idle reiteration. God bears compassionately with all our ignorances, but this is what our Lord compared to mere stuttering, and "the tumbling out of empty words." And in its ultimate degradation prayer sinks into the fetichistic mechanism of the Tartar's supplication, who thinks that "with every clatter of his prayer-mill he offers so many thousand prayers. Long prayers may sometimes have their place, as when Jesus spent all night in prayer. Repeated prayers may sometimes have their place, as when in Gethsemane He prayed thrice, using the same words. Augustine tells us that he once spent all the night in the simple prayer, *Noverim Te, Domine; noverim me!* A prayer is not a repetition, so long as it is a genuine out-pouring of the heart; but it ceases to be a prayer at all the moment that it becomes a mechanical weariness. It changes from prayer into "*battologia*" the moment the heart has ceased to follow what the lips repeat. Long formal services in our churches may degenerate into a mere superstition, a material function, an idle waste of time. The longest prayer which Scripture contains, that

of Solomon at the dedication of the temple, would hardly occupy seven minutes. The briefest prayers which Scripture records were the most intense, the most potent—" *God be merciful to me the sinner!*" " *Lord, remember me when Thou comest in Thy kingdom!*" " *Lord Jesus, receive my spirit!*" When our Lord gave His model prayer, saying, " *Thus pray ye,*" knowing our wants, knowing our nature, knowing whereof we are made, remembering that we are but dust, His model was brevity itself.

iii. Lastly,—for at present we are only looking at the outward characteristics of Christ's perfect prayer,—observe its directness, its freedom from all formality.

"What God requires and looks at," says Bishop Hall, "is neither the arithmetic of our prayers, how many they are; nor the rhetoric of our prayers, how eloquent they be; nor the geometry of our prayers, how long they be; nor the music of our prayers, how sweet our voice may be; nor the logic, nor the method, nor even the orthodoxy of our prayers"—but the one thing that avails in them is fervent sincerity. Let us not deceive ourselves for a moment as to the value of outward functions, which may only deaden us into spiritual torpor, or inflate us with self-satisfaction. Far better that our prayer should only occupy one minute, and be from the heart, rising like incense from the golden censer of our one High Priest, than that it should be kindled with the strange fire of Pharisaic pride.

iv. How much may be learnt from the characteristics of the prayer itself, we may see hereafter; meanwhile, its *infinite adaptability* proves its heavenly origin. It has been tested for nearly twenty centuries by all sorts and conditions of men in every clime, under every variety of circumstance. Not one has ever found it wanting. Carlyle, in a pathetic letter to Erskine of Linlathen, tells his friend that he was "dule and wae" on hearing of a recent bereavement, and had the night before repeated to himself the Lord's Prayer.

“Our Father!” he writes, “in my sleepless tossings, these words, that brief and grand prayer, came strangely into my mind with an altogether new emphasis; as if written and shining for me in mild, pure splendour on the black bosom of the night there; when I, as it were, read them, word by word, with a sudden check to my imperfect wanderings, with a sudden softness of composure which was much unexpected. Not for perhaps thirty or forty years had I once formally repeated that prayer; *nay, I never felt before how intensely the voice of man’s soul it is*, the inmost inspiration of all that is high and pious in poor human nature, right worthy to be recommended with an “After this manner pray ye.”

F. W. FARRAR.

EVANGELIUM SECUNDUM PETRUM.

THE Gospel fragment identified by M. Bouriant as part of the Apocryphal Gospel of Peter, and recently published by him among the *Mémoires of the French Archaeological Mission at Cairo*, is already, thanks to the diligence of Professor Swete and Mr. Robinson, conveniently accessible in two forms. Professor Swete has prefixed to his edition a short catena of the passages in Patristic literature which “bear witness to the early circulation of a Petrine Gospel, or convey the judgment of church writers upon it,” embodying in his text of Serapion’s letter the emendations suggested by Dr. Westcott (*Canon of N.T.*, p. 391). Mr. Robinson prefaces his text with a lecture which includes a translation of the whole document, and a rich collection of references to illustrative parallels drawn from a large range in early Christian literature. He has also placed references in the margin of the Greek text opposite all the lines which contain parallels to statements or phrases *peculiar to one* of the four canonical Gospels. As he has endeavoured with good success to make this list exhaustive, and has rigidly excluded all other Gospel references—even to passages peculiar to the common element in St. Matthew and St. Mark—the use made of the distinctive parts of each Gospel may be seen at a glance.

The contents of the fragment are as follows :—¹

1. But of the Jews none washed his hands, neither Herod nor any one of His judges. And when they wished to wash them Pilate rose up. And then Herod the king commanded that the Lord be taken, saying to them, What things soever I commanded you to do unto Him, do.

¹ Mr. Robinson’s courtesy enables me to give the translation embedded in his lecture, and to incorporate the corrections which will shortly appear in his second edition.

2. And there was come there Joseph, the friend of Pilate and of the Lord; and knowing that they were about to crucify Him, he came to Pilate and asked the body of the Lord for burial. And Pilate sent to Herod and asked His body. And Herod said, Brother Pilate, even if no one had asked Him, we should have buried Him; since indeed the sabbath draweth on: for it is written in the law, that the sun go not down on him that is put to death, on the day before the unleavened bread, which is their feast.

3. And they took the Lord and pushed Him as they ran, and said, Let us drag away the Son of God, having obtained power over Him. And they clothed Him with purple, and set Him on the seat of judgement, saying, Judge righteously, O king of Israel. And one of them brought a crown of thorns and put it on the head of the Lord. And others stood and spat in His eyes, and others smote His cheeks: others pricked Him with a reed; and some scourged Him, saying, With this honour let us honour the Son of God.

4. And they brought two malefactors, and they crucified the Lord between them. But He held His peace, as having in no wise pain. And when they had raised the cross they wrote upon it, This is the King of Israel. And having set His garments before Him they parted them among them, and cast a lot for them. And one of those malefactors reproached them, saying, We have suffered thus for the evils that we have done, but this man, having become the Saviour of men, what wrong hath He done to you? And they, being angered at Him, commanded that His legs should not be broken, that he might die in torment.

5. And it was noon, and darkness covered all Judea: and they were troubled and distressed, lest the sun was going down, since He yet lived: [for] it is written for them, that the sun go not down on Him that is put to death. And one of them said, Give Him to drink gall with vinegar;

And they mixed and gave Him to drink, and fulfilled all things, and accomplished their sins against their own head. And many went about with lamps, supposing that it was night, and fell down. And the Lord cried out, saying, My power, My power, thou hast forsaken Me. And when He had said it He was taken up. And in that hour the vail of the temple of Jerusalem was rent in twain.

6. And they drew out the nails from the hands of the Lord, and laid Him upon the earth, and the earth all quaked, and great fear arose. Then the sun shone, and it was found the ninth hour : and the Jews rejoiced, and gave His body to Joseph that he might bury it, since he had seen what good things He had done. And he took the Lord, and washed Him, and wrapped Him in a linen cloth, and brought Him into his own tomb, which was called the Garden of Joseph.

7. Then the Jews and the elders and the priests, seeing what evil they had done to themselves, began to lament and to say, Woe for our sins : for the judgment and the end of Jerusalem hath drawn nigh. And I with my companions was grieved ; and being wounded in mind we hid ourselves : for we were being sought for by them as malefactors, and as wishing to set fire to the temple. And upon all these things we fasted and sat mourning and weeping night and day until the sabbath.

8. But the scribes and Pharisees and elders being gathered together one with another, when they heard that all the people murmured and beat their breasts, saying, If by His death these most mighty signs have come to pass, see how just He is,—the elders were afraid and came to Pilate, beseeching him and saying, Give us soldiers, that they may watch His sepulchre for three days, lest His disciples come and steal Him away, and the people suppose that He is risen from the dead and do us evil. And Pilate gave them Petronius the centurion with soldiers to watch the tomb.

And the elders and scribes came with them to the sepulchre, and having rolled a great stone along with the centurion and the soldiers, they all together who were there set it at the door of the sepulchre ; and they put upon it seven seals, and they pitched a tent there and kept watch.

9. And early in the morning as the Sabbath was drawing on, there came a multitude from Jerusalem and the region round about, that they might see the sepulchre that was sealed. And in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept watch two by two on guard, there was a great voice in the heaven ; and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descending thence with great light and approaching the tomb. And that stone which was put at the door rolled away of itself and departed to one side ; and the tomb was opened and both the young men entered in.

10. When therefore the soldiers saw it, they awakened the centurion and the elders, for they too were hard by keeping watch ; and, as they declared what things they had seen, again they see coming forth from the tomb three men, and the two supporting the one, and a cross following them. And of the two the head reached unto the heaven, but the head of Him that was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens, saying, Hast thou preached to them that sleep ? And an answer was heard from the cross, Yea.

11. They therefore considered one with another whether to go away and show these things to Pilate. And while they yet thought thereon the heavens again appear opened, and a certain man descending and entering into the sepulchre. When the centurion and they that were with him saw these things, they hastened by night to Pilate, leaving the tomb which they were watching, and declared all things which they had seen, being sore distressed, and saying, Truly He was the Son of God. Pilate answered

and said, I am pure from the blood of the Son of God: but ye determined this. Then they all drew near and besought him and entreated him to command the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing of the things which they had seen: For it is better, say they, for us to incur the greatest debt of sin before God, and not to fall into the hands of the people of the Jews and to be stoned. Pilate therefore commanded the centurion and the soldiers to say nothing.

12. And at dawn upon the Lord's day Mary Magdalene, a disciple of the Lord [who], fearing because of the Jews, since they were burning with wrath, had not done at the Lord's sepulchre the things which the women are wont to do for those that die and that are beloved by them, took her friends with her and came to the sepulchre where He was laid. And they feared lest the Jews should see them, and they said, Even if on that day on which He was crucified we could not weep and lament, yet now let us do these things at His sepulchre. But who shall roll away for us the stone that is laid at the door of the sepulchre, that we may enter in and sit by Him and do the things that are due? For the stone was great, and we fear lest some one see us. And even if we cannot, yet if we shall set at the door the things which we bring for a memorial of Him, we will weep and lament, until we come unto our home.

13. And they went away and found the tomb opened, and coming near they looked in there; and they see there a certain young man, sitting in the midst of the tomb, beautiful and clothed in a very bright robe; who said to them, Why are ye come? Whom seek ye? Is it that crucified One? He is risen and gone away. But if ye believe not, look in and see the place where He lay, that He is not [here]; for He is risen, and gone away thither, whence He was sent. Then the women feared and fled.

14. Now it was the last day of the unleavened bread, and many went forth returning to their homes, as the feast was

ended. But we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and were grieved: and each one grieving for that which was come to pass, departed to his home. But I Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother took our nets and went away to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord . . .

As the contents of the document and its more obvious characteristics have already been more than once described at length, I propose to proceed at once to point out some hitherto unnoticed traces of the use of this document in early Christian literature, and to consider the relation in which it stands to the canonical Gospels.

And first it is natural to turn our attention to Origen. He is the one early writer who refers by name to the Gospel of Peter as an authority for a definite statement (*in Mat. tom. x. 17*). Unfortunately the limits of our fragment do not enable us to verify the accuracy of his reference—it contains no reference to the brethren of Jesus. And still more unfortunately the latter part of Origen's commentary on St. Matthew (from xxii. 33 to the end) is extant only in Latin. The following parallels seem to me however to deserve careful attention.

(1) "Et ipse quidem se lavit, illi autem *non solum se mundare noluerunt* a sanguine Christi, sed etiam super se susceperunt, dicentes: Sanguis ejus super nos, et super filios nostros."—*Orig. in Mat.*, 124.

Cf. § 1. καὶ [τῶν] βουληθέντων νίψασθαι.

It is difficult to interpret M. Bouriant's brackets, but if they are meant to indicate illegibility in the MS., it would be tempting to read, as has already been suggested, καὶ μὴ βουληθέντων.

The next parallel is more important. It forms the conclusion of the discussion of the mockery with the reed.

(2) "Et in his omnibus *unigenita virtus nocita non est, sicut nec passa est aliquid*, facta pro nobis maledictum, cum naturaliter benedictio esset;

sed cum benedictio esset, consumpsit et solvit et dissipavit omnem maledictionem humanam.”—*Orig. in Mat.*, 125.

Cf. § 4. αὐτὸς δὲ ἐσώπα ὡς μηδὲν πόνον ἔχων.

The words in the Gospel seem to be Docetic in intent. But Origen’s comment shows that it is quite possible to give them an innocent interpretation. And the use of “virtus” is interesting in view of the use of *δύναμις* in the cry from the cross as recorded in this Gospel.

(3) “Arbitror ergo, sicut cætera signa, quæ facta sunt in passione ipsius, in Jerusalem tantummodo facta sunt, sic et *tenebræ tantummodo super omnem terram Judæam* sunt factæ usque ad horam nonam. Quæ autem dico, *in Jerusalem* tantummodo hæc facta sunt: *quod velum templi scissum est, quod terra contremuit, quod petra diruptæ sunt, quod monumenta aperta sunt.*”—*Orig. in Mat.*, 134.

Cf. § 5. σκότος κατέσχε πάσαν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν . . . διερίγη τὸ καταπέτασμα τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ εἰς δύο.

Here necessity for defining the extent of the darkness is expressly stated in the context, and Origen may very well have arrived at “Judæa” independently. But the need for specifying the locality of the Temple “in Jerusalem” is not so obvious, and may be an echo of our Gospel.

The presence of the words in the Gospel seems a clear sign that it must have originated outside Palestine. The explanatory comment, *τῆς ἑορτῆς αὐτῶν*, § 2, seems to point in the same direction. Cf. St. John vi. 4, etc.

(4) “Et utetur quis hoc textu, videns eos ex quibusdam auditionibus sive ethnicorum verborum, sive barbaricorum sermonum congregantes, et facientes narrationem quasi spongiam quandam, adimplentes eam non de verbo potabili, neque de vino lætificante cor hominis, neque de aqua refectionis, sed de aliquo contrario, et *nocivo*, et non potabili *aceto* intelligibili: et hanc spongiam imponunt calamo scripturæ suæ, et quantum ad se, *lesiones inferunt Jesu ex hujusmodi potu* . . . sunt autem qui et *acetum et fel*, sicut Joannes scribit, offerunt ori ejus.”—*Orig. in Mat.*, 137.

καὶ τὶς αὐτῶν εἶπεν Ποτίσατε αὐτὸν χολὴν μετὰ ὄξους· καὶ κεράσαντες ἐπότισαν, καὶ ἐπλήρωσαν πάντα, καὶ ἐτελείωσαν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς αὐτῶν τὰ ἁμαρτήματα.—§ 5.

The interesting point here is that Origen expressly recognizes a baleful character in the potion. The language in the Gospel, both in describing the purpose of the draught, as springing from fear lest Jesus should survive the sunset, and in treating the action of the Jews in the matter as the climax of their guilt, suggests that "the gall" was regarded as a poison.

In this connexion it is worth remembering that ψΝΓ, which is translated by "gall" in Psalm lxix. 21, quite naturally supports this interpretation, since, like the Latin "*fel*," it may be translated either "gall" or "poison."

(5) "*Miseri sunt ergo Judæi post crudelem condemnationem eorum, qui quantum ad existimationem eorum vivebant in cruciatio terribili.*

. . . Aut forte non propter misericordiam hoc fecerunt Judæi, sed *principaliter propter sabbatum*, ut non maneat corpora super crucem in sabbato."—*Orig. in Mat.*, 140.

Cf. § 1. ἐκέλευσαν ἵνα μὴ σκελοκοπηθῆ, ὅπως βασιανιζόμενος ἀποθάνοι.

And § 2. ἥλιον μὴ δῦναι ἐπὶ πεφονεμένῳ πρὸ μιᾶς τῶν ἡζύμων.

Cf. also *contra Celsum*, III. 48.

This is in some respects the most interesting of all the parallels. Hitherto Origen has stood alone in suggesting at least the possibility of a merciful intent, underlying the torture of the "Crurifragium."

(6) "Jesus ergo cum non fuerit percussus et speraretur diu pendens in cruce maiora pati tormenta oravit Patrem, et exanditus est, et *statim ut clamavit ad Patrem, receptus est*: aut sicut qui potestatem habebat ponendi animam suam, posuit eam quando voluit ipse; quod prodigium stupuit centurio factum, et dixit, 'Vere hic homo Filius erat Dei.' Miraculum enim erat quoniam post tres horas *receptus est* qui forte biduum victurus erat in cruce secundum consuetudinem eorum qui suspenduntur quidem, non autem percutiuntur . . . et observa quoniam apud Marcum ubi centurio nullum miraculum vidisse refertur, hominem dicit Jesum Filium Dei."—*Orig. in Mat.*, § 140.

Cf. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνελήθη. § 5.

There is some confusion in this last sentence, because the earlier part of the comment springs far more naturally from St. Mark's narrative of the incident, in which attention is

concentrated on the manner of the death “ὅτι οὕτως ἐξέπνευσεν” or “ὅτι οὕτως κράξας ἐξέπνευσεν,” than from St. Matthew’s, in which our attention is distracted by reference to the concomitant signs. And so Origen cannot have regarded St. Mark as silent with regard to that which on his own showing was the real “Miracle” in the matter; especially as he gives the words of the Centurion, when he first has occasion to quote them, in the form peculiar to St. Mark (xv. 39); and as the surprise expressed at the speediness of the death finds its only parallel in the same source (xv. 44).

For our immediate purpose, however, the interest of the quotation centres in the twice repeated phrase “*receptus est*,” which it is difficult not to regard as a distinct echo of the mysterious “ἀνελήφθη” of our text.

The phrases in the Canonical Gospels ἐξέπνευσεν (Mark, Luke), ἀφήκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (Matthew), παρέδωκεν τὸ πνεῦμα (John), are clearly quite distinct; the only real parallels being found in explicit references to the Ascension, Acts i. 2, 1 Tim. iii. 16, [Mark] xvi. 19; cf. Luke ix. 51.

It is clearly, therefore, misleading to follow M. Bouriand in translating the word “died.”

Following so closely on the Docetic version of the cry from the Cross, and in the light of the well known Gnostic application of this very utterance, the original intention of the word can hardly be regarded as doubtful (cf. Mr. Robinson *in loc.*). But Origen’s use of the passage seems to show that here again words originally Docetic were patient of an Orthodox application; especially when the scoffs of Celsus had given believers an additional reason for guarding against any possible aspersions on the dignity of the Crucified. See, for instance,

γυνὴ δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς κράξας φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἀφήκε τὸ πνεῦμα—καὶ ὡς βασιλέως καταλιπόντος τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐνεργήσαντος μετὰ δυνάμεως καὶ ἐξουσίας.—*Orig. in Joan. xix. 4.*

The other source to which I wish to direct attention is the Fifth Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions* in both its extant recensions. The earlier of these, commonly called "Didascalia," is preserved only in a Syriac version. The quotations given from it are taken from Lagarde's re-translation into Greek. The later is quoted as *Apost. Const.*, and is extant in the original Greek.

It will be noticed that a good many of the more remarkable parallels have been absorbed in the process of revision. And yet the later form contains some which are not found in the earlier, at any rate in the form in which we know it at present.

The first of these passages (the reference to which I owe to an article in the *Guardian*, Dec. 7, 1892) contains a remarkably close parallel to the opening clauses of the Gospel, not only in structure, but in the startling declaration that the order for the crucifixion was given by "Herod the king."

(1) ὁ μὲν ἀλλόφυλος κριτῆς νιψάμενος τῆς χεῖρας εἶπεν· Ἀθῶός εἰμι ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ δικαίου τούτου, ἡμεῖς ὄψεσθε. ὁ δὲ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπεβόησε· Τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα ἡμῶν· καὶ Ἡρώδης ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐκέλευσεν αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι.—*Didasc.* v. 19.

In the *Apostolic Constitutions* this passage is quietly assimilated to Acts iv. 27, still retaining, however, the title of "king" (cf. Mk. vi. 14) for Herod the Tetrarch.

(2) καὶ Πιλάτος ὁ ἡγεμὼν καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης ἐκέλευσαν αὐτὸν σταυρωθῆναι, καὶ πληροῦται τὸ φάσκον λόγιον Ἰνατί ἐφρνώξαν, κ.τ.λ.—*Const. Apost.* v. 19.

The next group of passages is interesting, as perhaps helping, towards the elucidation of the chronology of this Gospel, and especially of the two kindred passages.

§ 7. ἐνηστεύομεν καὶ ἐκαθεζόμεθα πειθοῦντες καὶ κλαίοντες νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας ἕως τοῦ σαββάτου.

And § 14. ἦν δὲ τελευταία ἡμέρα τῶν ἀζύμων.

(3) ἐσθίοντες γὰρ τὸ πάσχα τρίτη τῶν σαββάτων ἑσπέρας ἐξήλθομεν εἰς τὸ ὄρος τῶν ἐλαιῶν. καὶ τῇ νυκτὶ ἐκράτησαν τὸν κύριον Ἰησοῦν. καὶ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τετάρτῃ τῶν σαββάτων ἔμεινεν ἐν φυλακῇ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Καιάφα τοῦ ἀρχιερέως. καὶ ταύτῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ συνήχθησαν οἱ ἄρχοντες τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ συνεβουλεύσαντο περὶ αὐτοῦ. καὶ τῇ πέμπτῃ τῶν σαββάτων ἀπαγούσιν αὐτὸν πρὸς Πιλάτον ἡγεμόνα καὶ ἔμεινε πάλιν ἐν φυλακῇ παρὰ Πιλάτον. τῇ μετὰ τὴν πέμπτῃ τῶν σαββάτων νυκτὶ παρασκευῆς οὔσης κατηγοροῦσιν αὐτοῦ ἐνώπιον Πιλάτου πολλά.—*Didasc.* v. 13.

(4) οὕτω γὰρ ἐνηστεύσαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς παθόντος τοῦ κυρίου εἰς μαρτύριον τῶν τριῶν ἡμερῶν.—*Didasc.* v. 19, cf. v. 16.

I half suspect that a misunderstanding of *σάββατον* in St. Luke xxiii. 56 underlies this chronology, both here and in the Gospel, but the solution of it is still to seek.

The passage from the *Apostolic Constitutions* is this time richer in points of direct contact with the Gospel than the passages in the *Didascalía*.

(5) καὶ ἀναστὰς ἐκ νεκρῶν, πρώτη μὲν φανεροῦται Μαρίᾳ τῇ Μαγδαληνῇ καὶ Μαρίᾳ τῇ Ἰακώβου, εἶτα Κλεόπα ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ, καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ [*leg. αὐτὸν*] ἡμῖν τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ φεύγουσι μὲν διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων, λαθραίως δὲ περιεργαζομένοις τὰ κατ' αὐτόν. ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἀνεγράφη. παρήγγειλεν οὖν ἡμῖν αὐτὸς νηστεύειν τὰς ἑξ ἡμέρας ταύτας διὰ τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων δυσσέβειαν καὶ παρανομίαν, πενθεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ ὑδίρεσθαι παρακελευσάμενος ἐπὶ τῇ ἀπωλείᾳ αὐτῶν.—*Const. Apost.* v. 14.

Cf. § 12. φοβουμένη διὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους.

καὶ ἐφοβοῦντο μὴ ἴδωσιν αὐτὰς οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι.

There is nothing in the canonical Gospels to indicate that the women who went to visit the tomb were at all afraid of being seen.

The following summaries of the events of the Passion seem to deserve quotation for purposes of comparison, especially when we remember that the narrative is put into the mouth of St. Peter (*Ap. Const.* v. 7, “*δι' ἐμοῦ Πέτρου*”).

(6) ὁ δὲ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος δι' ἡμᾶς ἐπλήγη, βλασφημίας ὑπέμεινε καὶ ὀνειδισμοὺς μακροθύμως, ἐνεπτόσθη, ἐκολαφίσθη,

ἐρραπίσθη, σταυρῷ μετὰ τὸ μαστιχθῆναι προσηλώθη, ὄξος καὶ χολὴν ἐποτίσθη, τελειώσας πάντα τὰ γεγραμμένα εἶπεν τῷ θεῷ καὶ πατρὶ Εἰς χεῖράς σου παρατίθεμαι τὸ πνεῦμά μου.—*Ap. Const.* v. 6.

(7) δῆμιοι δὲ παραλαβόντες τὸν τῆς δόξης κύριον ξύλῳ προσήλωσαν, ἕκτη μὲν ὥρᾳ σταυρώσαντες αὐτόν, τρίτη δὲ ὥρᾳ τὴν ἀπόφασιν δεξάμενοι τὴν κατ' αὐτοῦ. ἔπειτα ἔδωκαν αὐτῷ ὄξος πιεῖν μετὰ χολῆς, εἶτα τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ κλήρῳ διεμερίσαντο, εἶτα δύο κακούργους ἐσταύρωσαν σὺν αὐτῷ ἐξ ἑκατέρου μέρους.—*Ap. Const.* v. 14.

The following references to the Ascension have at least one point of connexion with our fragment, besides supplying one or two phraseological illustrations:—

(8) διαταξάμενος ἡμῖν ἀνελήφθη ἐπ' ὄψει ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν πρὸς τὸν ἀποστείλαντα αὐτόν, καὶ ἐὰν μὲν πιστεύσητε, μακάριοι γενήσεσθε, εἰ δὲ ἀπιστήσετε, ἀθῶοι ἡμεῖς εἴρεθησόμεθα καὶ καθαροὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας δυσπιστίας.—*Ap. Const.* v. 7.

(9) ἀναληφθέντα διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ πατρός αὐτοῦ ἐπ' ὄψεσιν ἡμετέραις.—*Ap. Const.* vi. 30.

(10) πληρώσας πᾶσαν διάταξιν ἀνελήφθη πρὸς τὸν ἀποστείλαντα αὐτὸν θεὸν καὶ πατέρα ἐπ' ὄψεσιν αὐτῶν.—*Ap. Const.* viii. 1.

Cf. ἀπῆλθεν ἐκεῖ ὅθεν ἀπεστάλη.—*Ev. Sec. Petr.* § 13.

If these passages are sufficient, as I think they are, to make out a strong case for the position that our fragment was in the hands both of Origen and of the author of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, it is clear that a careful comparison of these two authorities may disclose yet further traces of this interesting document.

J. O. F. MURRAY.

THE LATE PROFESSOR HORT.

I.

No more serious blow has ever fallen upon the critical study of theology than that which has deprived us of the unequalled knowledge and acumen of Dr. Hort. In Cambridge especially a void is left which cannot be filled. When Bishop Lightfoot died, we tried to console ourselves with the sense that his two great colleagues still remained : when Dr. Westcott closed his books and left us, we still had Dr. Hort : but his death is our *τρικυμία* of loss, and for a time, at least, we cannot but feel orphaned and almost paralysed. But he has created for us an ideal of scholarly attainment and exquisite workmanship which must remain, not only as a standard, but also as an inspiration.

The aim of the present notice is to set forth something of his method as a worker, to endeavour to indicate what main services he has rendered to theological criticism, and to bring together some reminiscences which may serve to illustrate the kind of help which some of the younger Cambridge students were privileged to gain from him.¹

It is somewhat obvious to begin by noting the extraordinary breadth both of his knowledge and of his intellectual sympathies. From the first he was unusually comprehensive in his range. His university degree included three First Classes : in Classics (bracketed 3rd), in Moral Philosophy, and in Natural Sciences (with special distinction in Physiology and Botany). During the Mathematical Tripos he was still weak from scarlet fever, and he was only allowed to take three papers, and not the three hardest, as he had requested ; consequently he only qualified, so as to be able to take the Classical Tripos two

¹ The outline of his life and work is well given in the *Guardian* (Dec. 6 and 13), and need not be repeated here ; and a vivid and inspiring sketch of him is drawn by Professor Ryle in the *Cambridge Review* (Dec. 7).

months later. At that time (1850) there was no Honours Examination in Theology. While still an undergraduate he had drawn forth from F. D. Maurice the important letter on Eternal Punishment (*Life and Letters*, ii. 15 ff.), and the close friendship which subsequently existed between them was not without its influence on both. To him Maurice looked as his guide in matters relating to the true text of the New Testament, and to Maurice's influence on him may perhaps be traced the careful study in the *Cambridge Essays* (1856), which still remains the completest account of Coleridge and his philosophical position. It is not generally known that he was joint-translator from the Latin of the hymn, "O Strength and Stay, upholding all creation," and that he wrote a poem, entitled "Tintern, October, 1885." He devoured all kinds of literature; but he was specially attached to Carlyle and Ruskin; he returned again and again to the "French Revolution," and he rarely left Cambridge without a volume of Ruskin among the numerous books that he took with him. He was in his own person a striking witness to the harmony of very varied forms of knowledge, and thus by his experience and his sympathy he did more perhaps than any one to obtain the recognition of the proper place of theology among the sciences of the University.

This width of range was not without effect upon his method as a worker in his chosen sphere. He was always large in his view; and notwithstanding his extreme fastidiousness and minuteness in investigation he always escaped the charge of pedantry. His mind was most astonishingly fertile in hypotheses. "It is a pity," he once said of an able investigator, "that he does not allow himself time to think of more than one theoretical possibility at once." This was a criticism which could never have been applied to any of his own work. A topic, he felt, must be approached from every side, before the expression of a judgment on it.

Even more remarkable than the extent of his knowledge was his accuracy. He never seemed to trust to memory. Book after book came down from his shelves in the course of conversation; fact after fact was verified. A patristic reference was generally accompanied by a comment on the value of the edition from which he quoted, and the use made in it of the extant MSS. In editing Marriott's Remains and Mackenzie's Hulsean Essay, he must have verified thousands of references. The printing of the New Testament was an education to the readers of the Press. The use of capitals, the division of Greek words at the end of a line, the spacings and punctuation—everything was based upon a principle, and carried out with the most patient watchfulness. A story is told of his troubled inquiry when an accent was unaccountably missing in the final proof, which he was prepared to prove had been rightly present in the previous one: the thin projection of the type had broken off in the printing! And again: "When we thought it was all finished, Dr. Hort went over it with a microscope!"

The work by which he will be longest and most widely remembered is this Greek Text of the New Testament. The principles on which it is based, and the decisions as to the readings adopted, are the result of the joint labours of Bishop Westcott and himself. They have told us that their conclusions were in every case reached independently in the first instance, and that where on comparison they were found to disagree the difference was discussed in writing until either the divergence disappeared or a final contrariety of judgment was declared. It is reassuring to learn that the vast collections which formed the basis of these arguments, as well as the important correspondence itself, are all most carefully preserved.

It was found necessary that the statement of fundamental principles should be drawn up by a single hand, and it is

to Dr. Hort's pen that we owe the *Introduction*. It is interesting to observe at what an early period his attention was given to the problems of textual criticism. As far back as 1855 we find him reviewing Tregelles' *Account of the Printed Text of the N.T.* in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*; and in 1858 he reviewed together the first numbers of the Texts of Tregelles and of Tischendorf (the so-called 7th edition), giving the palm for accuracy and discernment to the former, while declaring both indispensable. It is worth while to quote at some length from his review of Scrivener's *Codex Augiensis* in 1860, for it contains a striking illustration of his textual position.¹

"It follows [from the evidence of quotations in the Fathers] that all our Greek MSS. except one (and for argument's sake we are willing to let that one go with the rest) were written subsequently to the appearance of those variations between which the modern critic has to decide. We possess however external criteria of Greek MSS. in versions and patristic quotations which are incontestably prior to most of the variations. These in turn require careful checking and testing; but to say, as some do, that the results obtained are necessarily precarious, is about as rational as for an astronomical amateur to deny that the motions of the planets can be accurately known, because he has become aware of the errors necessarily involved in every rough observation through the imperfection of instruments and the complication of physical laws. The elimination of errors, so far as they affect general results, is as possible in the one case as in the other. Every document can be tried by a reference to the numerous passages in which the abundance of early testimony leaves no moral doubt as to the reading and yet the numerical preponderance of MSS. favours what is clearly the wrong side. The process may be carried to any length, and all the minuter affinities and peculiarities approximately ascertained. And a document thus tried and characterized becomes in turn, by itself or in conjunction with others, a standard by which fresh evidence may be tested. The transcendent value of such a process arises from its enabling us to advance cautiously from the known to the unknown, to supply the lack of discriminative evidence in an immense number of passages by our knowledge of the special character of each important witness derived from more fortunate verses."

Here we see him already beginning to state great prin-

¹ *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology*, No. xii. p. 379 f.

ciples of discrimination by which the vast chaos of textual material, accumulated by the labours of others, might be reduced to some kind of order. The modesty of the *Introduction* would lead us to suppose that he had done nothing himself to contribute to the collection of evidence. But any one who reads carefully the Preface to the *Addenda et Corrigenda* of Tregelles' edition will discover that he must have verified practically the whole of Tregelles' work, besides adding very largely to the presentation of the patristic testimony.

The scientific character of the *Introduction* deserves to be insisted on. More than fifty pages, near the beginning, are devoted to explaining "the Methods of Textual Criticism," and, being totally devoid of any illustration, except by means of mathematical symbols, would apply equally well to Chinese MSS. as to Greek MSS of the New Testament. They expound the foundation principles of all criticism of the textual evidence of any writings whatever; and their careful study by the students of the classical Greek and Latin writings in especial might lead to very important results.

The reiterated charge against Dr. Hort's conclusions as to the New Testament text is that they are wholly unsupported by evidence. This is not the occasion on which to enter upon a great controversy, nor even to indicate an opinion as to the side on which the greater share of truth may seem to lie. But the accusation of building without foundations is a serious one, and in the present case peculiarly unjust. And yet it is urged with a certain plausibility. We are presented throughout with results, and with the character of the methods by which the results are reached. But the actual processes in each case are not as a rule disclosed. In the words of a great scholar, who was affectionately attached to him, though he questioned some of his textual decisions, "his New Testament criticism was based on a

huge induction of facts which has not been published ; and those who have not gone through the same work are not entitled to dispute his judgments."¹ Under the circumstances this reserve was unavoidable ; as it is, the introductory matter fills 550 closely printed pages ; nor should it be forgotten that 140 of these pages are expressly occupied with "Notes on Select Readings," *i.e.* with important specimens of the application of the methods to particular disputed passages. And those who desire to watch the great investigator at work, and to follow every detail of the process, have only to turn to the first of the famous "Two Dissertations," to see at once the breadth and the minuteness which were both so characteristic of his treatment.

It would be a mistake to leave the impression that Textual Criticism engrossed his whole attention. The great article on "Basilides," one of his many contributions to the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, or his identification of the Latin Version of Theodore of Mopsuestia on St. Paul's Epistles, would alone be disproof of this ; and, to give another single illustration, the letters on the "Codex Amiatinus" in the *Academy* showed his complete mastery of the whole of the Bede literature. Perhaps no one has ever been so free from what he once called "that fatal lack of comprehensiveness which has marred so much of German theology."

The reserve of argument which has been noted as inevitable, if the *Introduction* were not to have extended to a thousand pages instead of five hundred, may be said to have been to some degree characteristic of Dr. Hort. We were

¹ Curiously similar are the words of another of the ablest of living critics of the N.T. Text: "Any opinion of Dr. Hort's deserves the greatest attention. We suspect that it will have been the experience of many others besides ourselves that although they may begin by differing from that eminent scholar they often end by agreeing with him, the reason being that his published opinions frequently rest upon facts and arguments which are not fully stated, but which the inquirer discovers for himself painfully by degrees" (*Guardian*, May 25; 1892).

brought to understand that his statements were the outcome of the most patient accumulation and digestion of all the available evidence. He seemed quite content to wait till we were enabled by fuller knowledge to reach the position which he held. When his statements were challenged on important points, and when his challenger carried away those whom he regarded as worthy to form a judgment if the evidence were before them, he felt a keen pain at the sense that the truth, as he saw it, was being temporarily obscured; but he rarely attempted to vindicate his position by controversy. He was satisfied to wait and be misunderstood for a time. Meanwhile he had himself carefully read and annotated the work of his opponent. "I cannot think that he has proved any one of his contentions." Thus much to set the mind of a younger student free from the over-mastering fascination which had beguiled his loyalty; but not a word of the reason for so stern a judgment. At last, when months afterwards some evidence is brought of a return to better paths, the quiet voice says: "I thought you would come to see it: I am only surprised that you did not see it sooner." And when some slight modification of a strong statement in the *Introduction* is cautiously suggested as possible: "No, I have not a word to withdraw." And the conviction grows that further study must restore the completest confidence.

Dr. Hort is to so many students little more than a book—or perhaps merely one of two familiar letters which appear in editions of the New Testament, like the symbol of a MS., as a kind of evidence to the text—that I may be pardoned if I try to picture him as we knew him in our midst at Cambridge. There was doubtless an occasional exaggeration in our talk about him. But he had so seldom failed us that we felt as if he really knew everything. Of the obscurest book we said, "Dr Hort is sure to have it"; of the most perplexing problem, "Dr. Hort knows the

solution, if he would only tell"; of any subject, "Dr. Hort will tell you all the literature." And indeed nothing seemed to have escaped him that had been done in any branch of theological research. If a younger student working at minute details in an obscure part of the field spoke to him of the progress of his work, he was sure to get more than sympathy: he heard of some other worker in the present or in the past, or of some *obiter dictum* of a foreign scholar bearing on a special point, and often he would find a letter on his table the next morning, supplementing what had been said in conversation, and containing a list of references which must have been a serious tax on time and patience the night before. Once he had kindly glanced through some proof-sheets; a long letter came, in which one sentence ran somewhat thus:—"Dr. — (a German scholar) made the same suggestion ten years ago, in such and such a number of such and such a Journal; I think it is probably right."

No one else could give this kind of help. Never did he for a moment grudge the time it took to give it. No wonder that a kind of cult arose among those who were privileged to enter his study or his lecture-room. What added to the spell was this. He would guide where guidance was really needed; he would always sympathize and encourage: he never seemed surprised at knowledge or ignorance; never shocked at the expression of the most crude opinion. But on the other hand he seemed to regard the formation of opinion as a very sacred thing; he refused to prejudice by arguing with one who was beginning the study of a subject. "What books would you recommend as the best introduction to the Synoptic question?" After some sympathetic preface came the words, never to be forgotten, "I should advise you to take your Greek Testament, and get your own view of the facts first of all."

Humility takes very different forms. Maurice, to judge

him from his writings, was intensely conscious of a mission, and at the same time loud in genuine self-depreciation. Lightfoot, on the contrary, was quietly conscious of strength, and never thought enough of self to speak either good or ill of it. Hort was different from both. His humility, which was very striking, came out in his extraordinary patience with a variant opinion. He treated it as he would treat a various reading, needing explanation of its genesis before it could fairly be set aside. To a dreadfully wild remark he replied with the greatest earnestness, "That is very important, if it can be established; Lagarde has expressed a very different view." In all this there was no seeming; the attitude of his mind was always that of patient learning. To a confession of ignorance as a disqualification for a certain undertaking, he replied in a careful letter: "Nor need you be perturbed by the consciousness of ignorance, though you must not expect to get free from it. As far as my experience goes, the more one learns, the more one's sense of ignorance increases, and that in more than double measure. We can only go blunderingly on according to the best of our lights, hoping that sooner or later the blunders will get corrected by others."

As a lecturer he was not popular with undergraduates: it was "too high art" for them, as they expressed it. But probably no Professor in any subject lectured to so many Bachelors and Masters of Arts. He taught the teachers; and he had little idea, I fancy, how wide was the influence thus indirectly exercised. He took infinite pains with his lectures: his words were most carefully chosen and guarded: he uttered them slowly, so that a rapid writer could take him down almost *verbatim*; and at one period he regularly spent the first twenty minutes of a lecture in rapidly repeating the previous one. As a rule he was engaged in the exposition of the New Testament, or of the early Patristic writings: most of the term being taken up with carefully

elaborated introductions. But two courses were of a different character, and seemed as though they were ultimately intended for publication: these occupied several terms and were entitled respectively, "Judaistic Christianity in the Apostolic and the following Age," and "Early Conceptions and Early History of the Christian Ecclesia."

When he published in 1854 some *Marginalia* on Eusebius, by Bishop Pearson—and this would seem to be his earliest contribution to patristic study—he wrote: "The scanty amount of Pearson's extant remains would surely justify a somewhat excessive care." We may well say the same to-day in reference to himself. I for one can testify to the valuable notes and references which lie in the margin of his copy of the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*; and in published writings he sometimes speaks of his "own margins." He spent a truly surprising amount of labour in editing with the utmost scrupulosity the works of others: may we not hope that some young scholars may be allowed the discipline of editing some of his Remains after his own model?

To those who did not know the master who is taken from our head to-day, the sketch which has been here attempted may seem unduly laudatory. I therefore gladly quote in conclusion some words of Dr. Salmon, the venerated scholar to whom I ventured to write while preparing this somewhat hurried notice, and from whom I have made one citation already. After some careful criticism, he says: "I tell you with perfect candour where I feel misgivings in my following of Hort, but you cannot exaggerate my feelings of love and admiration of the man, and are quite free to tell how highly he was thought of outside his own University. Alas! that I should have to call Cambridge his own. For born in Dublin he ought to have belonged to us."

I have said nothing directly as to his religious character;

but here, as in all else, he combined in a rare degree comprehensiveness of view with intense convictions, and he was a most loyal and devoted son of the English Church. The bowed head covered with his hands, as we sat waiting for the commencement of his lecture, made us feel that we trod with him on sacred ground; and his whole bearing was at all times that of one who realized a Higher Presence. There was a beautiful unity about his life, and the memory of it quickens diligence and faith and prayer.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

II.

It may be not unbecoming for one who cannot pretend to estimate Dr. Hort's merits as a theologian, to venture to add a word on the loss which ancient history has sustained by his death. In an epoch of surpassing interest in the history of the world, his work is a sure and strong foundation for the historian to work on; and it could never have been so if he had confined his survey to the Christian documents alone, and had not been guided by a wide outlook over the whole field of contemporary history. The early Christian writers were environed by the Roman Empire; and one could not talk for half an hour with Dr. Hort without seeing how clearly he realized that fact and the necessary inference from it, that the want of a vivid and accurate conception of the Roman world as a whole is certain to produce distortion in one's conception of the historical position of the early Christian writers. Many of the modern German theories about them could never have been proposed had the authors possessed a good and clear idea of the whole life and history of the period. From such falseness of view, and from other possible distortions in a different direction, Dr. Hort was saved, partly of course by his natural genius, but to a considerable extent by his

university training ; and I hope the day is far distant when theologians will start without such preliminary discipline in historical facts and method. Perhaps also one may express the hope, with which I know that Dr. Hort strongly sympathized, that the day will soon come when the historians will recognise how much they sacrifice by their almost complete overlooking of the early Christian writers as authorities for the general history of the period.

The first time that I had the opportunity of meeting Dr. Hort—in Dr. Westcott's house at Cambridge in 1887—was only sufficient for me to learn what a vigorous, sympathetic, wide, and masculine intellect his was. But the only occasion on which I could really profit by his knowledge was in June, 1892, when his health was already broken. Dr. Sanday ordered me (for his advice I accepted as a command) to call on him, and had arranged that my call should not seem an intrusion. The conversation was entirely about the lectures which I had just had the honour of giving at Mansfield College ; and I was much encouraged to find that many of the views I had expressed met with his cordial approval, and that his criticisms on matters of detail as a rule only strengthened the general position. In one point I owe him eternal gratitude. I mentioned that the period to which tradition assigned the New Testament documents seemed to me to be correct in all cases except one : First Peter appeared to me to be fixed inexorably to a period 75–85 A.D. Before I could go on to state the inference which appeared to me necessary, and which I had drawn in one of my lectures—that the Epistle could not be the work of the apostle—he broke in with much animation that he had always felt that there was no tradition of any value as to the date of Peter's death : the martyrdom was clearly and well attested, but its period rested on no authority. I caught from him at once the idea, which I have since worked out at some length, that First Peter,

though composed about A.D. 80, is still a genuine work. At the time he seemed very favourably inclined to this view, and suggested several points bearing on it. Perhaps on subsequent reflection he may have seen objections to it which did not come up in conversation; nor do I wish to claim him as finally supporting this view, because he for a short time busied himself in suggesting circumstances that told in its favour, several of which were of a kind that I cannot myself use, as I restrict myself to external and archæological evidence. But certain it is that I left him (after he had kept me so long that I feared it would do him harm in his obviously weak state) with the impression in my mind that he would work out the idea in lines different from mine, and in a way that I could not attain to. Whether he afterwards rejected it or not will now perhaps never be known.

Recently there have been in England at least two schools of ancient investigation which had no superiors in Europe: the school of Lightfoot, Hort, and Westcott in Cambridge, and the Numismatic department in the British Museum. The *Texts and Studies* is a pleasant sign that the Cambridge school is not expiring as its three great founders disappear from the University.

W. M. RAMSAY.

*APOLOGETIC ARGUMENT FROM THE NAMES IN
ROMANS XVI.*

IN perusing lately the sixteenth chapter of Romans it struck me with special force that the number and character of the names here given furnish an apologetic argument not sufficiently emphasized and used.

This chapter (xvi. 1-24) is part of the Epistle to the Romans. It is found in its proper place in all the manuscripts and versions, so that it stands in an entirely different position from Mark xvi. 9-20. Moreover the Epistle was accepted as genuine by the Roman church without the shadow of a doubt, so far as the records of antiquity bear witness.

It is true that some have rejected chapters xv. and xvi. altogether as spurious. It would appear that this was the case with Marcion in ancient times. But the very words which Origen uses with regard to Marcion's treatment of the chapters (*abstulit, dissecuit*) seem to imply that they were at the close of the Epistle before that heretic's day. In modern times Baur took up a similar position, though Hilgenfeld, his successor as leader in the Tübingen School, holds that they are genuine and in their proper place.

There are some modern critics of weight who accept chapter xvi. as Pauline, but maintain that here it is in the wrong place. It was probably an Epistle, or part of an Epistle, to the Ephesians, or of this Epistle as sent to the Ephesians as well as to the Romans. So Renan, Reuss, Weiss, and others. But this view is maintained chiefly on subjective or alleged internal grounds, and not on historic facts. In no case is the chapter appended to the Ephesians, and not a hint has come down from antiquity that it is out of its proper place. Indeed the roll of names itself makes that impossible. It is impossible that such a multitude of

names could have been accepted by the church at Rome as members and distinguished workers in it, if they had not been actually so. We therefore accept chapter xvi. 1-24 as an integral part of Romans.¹

Now the lists of names here given are at first sight utterly antagonistic to the idea of the Epistle being a forgery. Let us try to suppose for a moment that it actually was a forgery. In that case what would have been among the conditions necessary to get it most successfully palmed off as genuine? One condition would have been that no name should have been used in connection with the writing of it by Paul except his own. The introduction of other names, whether real or fictitious, would have opened up the way to the inevitable detection of the fraud. Again, another condition, corresponding to the above, would have been to address it to the church at Rome, without mentioning any names at all professedly connected with that church. For to do this would in like manner have opened up the way to certain detection. When a bill is forged, the name of the professed acceptor thereupon is sure to lead to detection, equally so whether it be the name of a real or fictitious person. When the time for dealing with the bill arrives, then, if the name be that of a real person, it is at once discovered by reference to him that his name has been forged; if the name be fictitious, it is at once discovered on inquiry that there is no such person. Thus it follows that in either case equally the forgery is brought to light. A forgery to be successful must, as far as possible, avoid putting forth names, whether real or fictitious.

But let us see how the matter stands. Paul, the professed author, mentions as forming part of his immediate circle at the time of writing no less than eight persons ex-

¹ For details, cf. Meyer's *Commentary*, critical introduction to chapter xv. Hilgenfeld, *Einleitung*, pp. 320 ff.; Weiss, *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i., pp. 320 ff. (Clark); Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, pp. 256 ff.

pressly named. Now it is difficult to suppose any forger bold enough to run the tremendous risk of detection by introducing so many names. If they were fictitious, then, from their alleged standing in the Church or community, the forgery must at once have become known, and the whole fraud would have been revealed. It is certain, however, that the names were real, some of them, such as Timothy, being beyond the possibility of suspicion. In this case, on the supposition that the Epistle was a fabrication, when the attempt was made to foist it in upon the Church, some of these men were sure to hear of it or come across it, and they would have been able at once to detect the forgery. Timothy (v. 21) was a close friend of Paul, and well known throughout the churches, and no one was more likely to know that the Epistle was a forgery if that was really the case. Tertius, "who wrote this Epistle" (v. 22), surely knew whether he had actually written it or not, and whether or not it was Paul who had dictated it to him. Gaius, "the host of the whole Church," and "Erastus, the chamberlain of the city" (v. 23), were both men in a public position, and well known in the Church and community, and therefore sure to have discovered it, if a forger had used their names illegitimately. These names accordingly form "References" of the highest order, guaranteeing that the Epistle was the genuine work of Paul. Such a use of the names of prominent men is not after the manner of the forger. It is one of the marks of the genuine author.

Again, let us look, on the other hand, at the persons to whom Paul sends salutations in the church at Rome. The explicit names are twenty-seven in number. Let us endeavour to suppose for a moment that all these names are sheer fabrications, and that no such persons had ever lived in connection with the Roman church. In this case we have to face the unlikely fact that any forger should have had the audacity to construct such a list, and the folly to run

the risk of certain detection to which it must have laid him open. When the Epistle made its way to Rome, even though it was a generation after the pretended time of writing, many of the members of the church there would have been able to say, "There never were any such persons in connection with our church; their names are not on our communion rolls, and therefore this must be the production of a forger." It is perhaps possible that two or three names might have dropped out of memory in the course of a few years, but that was not possible with twenty-seven names. In short, in view of the fact that the Epistle was accepted by the Roman church, the large number of names makes it incredible that the Roman list can be a fabrication.

It will appear still more impossible that the Roman names can have been mere fabrications when we consider not only the number but the standing of the persons to whom the Apostle is represented as sending salutations. They were not obscure men, unknown in the Church, for many of them, if real persons, must have been well known. This certainly was the case with Priscilla and Aquila, "to whom all the churches of the Gentiles give thanks" (v. 4). It must have been the case with Andronicus and Junia, who were "of note among the Apostles" (v. 7). It must also have been the case in some degree with Mary, "who bestowed much labour on you" (v. 12); with Tryphæna and Tryphosa, "who laboured in the Lord," and with Persis, "who laboured much in the Lord" (v. 12). Again we say, if these names were fictitious, the members of the Roman church, even a generation after the accepted date of the Epistle, must have known the fact, and thus when the Epistle was launched upon the Church must have been able to detect the forgery. The supposition of forgery therefore becomes untenable.

On the other hand, let us now suppose that the Roman names are genuine. This is the conclusion to which we

have just been led by finding that the theory of forgery will not work, and it is further proved by the fact that the Roman church accepted the Epistle without the echo of a doubt. In that case these twenty-seven names constitute a powerful body of testimony in favour of the Epistle. They are in an emphatic sense "References," authenticating its genuineness. They are sufficient in number; they are adequate in character; they had excellent means of knowing the facts; they are—some of them at least—persons of position and well known in the Church. Very particularly there were some amongst them personally acquainted with Paul. This was true of Priscilla and Aquila, "my helpers in Christ Jesus" (v. 3); of "my beloved Epænetus" (v. 5); of Amplias and Stachys, "my beloved" (v. 9). There were even some amongst them who were positively "kinsmen" of Paul. This was true of Andronicus and Junias, "my kinsmen and my fellow-prisoners" (v. 7), and of Herodion, "my kinsman" (v. 11). The fact then that the Roman church accepted the Epistle is proof that these names were all genuine, and being genuine they carry with them a powerful authentication of the Epistle as the work of Paul.

The list of persons mentioned belonging to the circle around Paul and at the Pauline end of the chain of evidence is an overwhelming guarantee of the genuineness of the Epistle, while the list of Roman names taken in connection with the reception of the Epistle furnishes a similar guarantee at the Roman end. But Phœbe comes in between in a peculiar way to link the two ends together. It is generally accepted that she is to be regarded as the bearer of the Epistle, and let it be noted that she is represented as an intimate friend of Paul's and a person of standing in the Church—"the deaconess of the church which is at Cenchreæ," and "a succourer of many" (v. 1, 2). Now, if the name and "commendation" of Phœbe were a pure fabrication, no Phœbe ever came to Rome, and the Romans

must have at once detected the fabrication and rejected the Epistle. But they accepted it, thus showing that Phœbe and her "letter of commendation" were alike realities. But if so, then Phœbe's personal testimony comes in and is most important. She knew Paul well, and came directly from him. She must have known that she received the Epistle from his hand and that it was genuine. Thus we have the Pauline end of the chain of evidence connected with the Roman end by the personal testimony of Phœbe. The chain of evidence furnished by the names is therefore complete.

We thus see that this chapter (xvi. 1-24), with its apparently almost barren list of names, turns out to contain within it a most important apologetic argument. It is a separate and independent proof of the genuineness of the Epistle to the Romans. But this is an Epistle which bears explicit testimony to the cardinal facts of Christ's history, with which apologetics have mainly to do. Paul, a junior contemporary of Christ, testifies therein amongst other things to the facts that our Lord was "of the seed of David according to the flesh" (Rom. i. 3); that He died on the cross (v. 6, vi. 6); that He rose from the dead, and was thereby "declared to be the Son of God with power" (i. 4, vi. 4, 5, 9, etc.); and that He ascended to heaven and took His place at the right hand of God (viii. 34). These facts carry with them the system of Gospel truth.

We only mention in closing that a similar argument with regard to the genuineness of Colossians might be constructed from the last chapter of that Epistle, in which we have eleven names mentioned in a similar way. The same holds good with regard to 2 Timothy, in which Epistle we have nineteen names mentioned besides that of Timothy.

ALEXANDER MAIR.

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

I. THE PART PLAYED BY ORAL TRADITION IN DETERMINING THE FORM AND CONTENTS OF THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS.

IT is well known to all students of recent literature on the origin of the Gospels, that the tendency of criticism has of late been decidedly unfavourable to the "Oral Theory." In proposing to discuss in this paper the part to be assigned to Oral Tradition in the production of our Synoptic Gospels, it is not my intention to call in question the general soundness of the opinion that,—after every allowance has been made for the difference between the habits of mind of the age in which, and the people among whom, the Gospel was first spread, and our own,—the similarities between the first three Gospels, both in the connexion and order of the narratives recorded and in actual phraseology, are such as cannot be satisfactorily explained without the assumption of a link, or links, through written composition. On the contrary, I myself share this opinion, and I have been led by such consideration as I have been able to give to the evidence, to accept the view now so generally held, that the first and third Evangelists had before them and used either our Gospel according to St. Mark, or a work closely resembling it.

It is, however, now commonly acknowledged that a considerable period, in which the communication of the Gospel was made solely by oral means, preceded its embodiment in writing. To the Oral Theory the merit is conceded (*e.g.* by Holtzmann, *Synopt. Evang.*, p. 50; comp. also B. Weiss, *Life of Jesus*, Eng. Trans., p. 28) that in

seizing upon this unquestionable fact its framers rightly conceived the spirit of the ancient world. But it will be worth while to examine more carefully than the advocates of the various "documentary" hypotheses appear to have done, what the influence of that first period may have been upon the written Gospels. Some of them would allow that the whole, or the greater part, of the subject-matter of the earliest of the Gospels was drawn directly from current oral tradition, and that the writers of the other Gospels supplemented to a limited extent from this source what they derived from their written sources (comp. Holtzmann, *ib.*, p. 52). But they conceive of this tradition as a mere floating, inorganic, chaotic mass. The question does not seem to have been sufficiently considered, whether the Oral Gospel, even if it never attained the high degree of fixity which the advocates of the "Oral Theory" find it necessary to attribute to it, may not have been marked by a certain amount of method. It does not appear to be in itself an improbable supposition that a certain way of telling the story of the Saviour's Life and Work should have become more or less habitual among the preachers and teachers of the Gospel; that certain outlines should have been in general followed, certain points have been seized upon and commonly set forth, and that too in the same general order, and that efforts more or less successful should have been made to preserve accuracy in the repetition even of words and sentences, especially in the case of the sayings of the Lord. If such was actually the case, a shaping influence may well have been thus exerted on the records first committed to writing, and it would be less unnatural that succeeding writers should have used these documents which adhered to the well-known outline; and they may thus have been controlled, too, in the extent of their additions to and divergencies from these sources.

The possibility that in this way the working of a common

consciousness in the Church, a common end and the experience of common needs on the part of the preachers and teachers of the Gospel, may to a limited extent and in conjunction with other causes have determined the form of the written records, has been, not so much combated, as ignored by most recent inquirers. But now Dr. Paul Ewald in a work to which Dr. Sanday drew attention in his articles on the Synoptic Question which appeared in *THE EXPOSITOR* during the earlier part of 1891, has denied expressly the operation of a common consciousness, or common action of any kind, in determining the form and contents of the Synoptic Gospels. And his argument is based not so much on the phenomena which they present in themselves, or on general considerations as to what such a cause might be capable of effecting, but on a comparison between these Gospels and the Fourth. Even by those who do not grant the Johannine authorship it is now admitted, he contends, that it must have been founded in part at least on true traditions. If so, these must, he urges, have been included in any Gospel which was in any sense the joint work of the Apostolic College, or of the Church at large; and Gospels from which, as from the first three, they are absent, cannot have this character.

This argument is not so new as might be imagined from Dr. Ewald's and Dr. Sanday's language. Meyer concludes his discussion of the Oral Theory with the reflection that apart from all other objections to it "the formation of such an original Gospel by means of the designed co-operation of the Apostles, would be simply irreconcilable with the contradictions which are presented by the Gospel of St. John" (*Com. on St. Matt.*, Eng. Trans., p. 33). And Holtzmann, who refers to Meyer, says, "If we assume the Fourth Gospel to be an authentic account, then the hypothesis (employed in the Oral Theory) becomes a complete impossibility" (*Synopt. Evang.*, p. 50, n. 4).

Dr. Ewald has, however, insisted on this argument with new emphasis. And this is not all. He has seen the necessity of finding some explanation of the "onesidedness" (to use his own expression) which, if St. John's Gospel be taken into account, must be held to belong to the narratives of the Synoptists. Even if we felt that we could take their Gospels by themselves alone, and supposed that any material connected with their subject which they did not use was of the same kind as that which they have preserved, the problem of their origin could not be satisfactorily solved by a mere literary examination of their relations, without an inquiry into the historical circumstances which may explain how the actual form that we see was adopted, and how all three were led to adhere to the same. Still more does such a general historical inquiry become necessary, if we believe in the authenticity, or even merely the substantial truth of the Fourth Gospel, and so find ourselves confronted with the question, "Wherefore the differences between it and the others?"

The advocates of the Oral Theory have not remained oblivious of this contrast. In fact their theory, which is said to be condemned by that contrast, might be justly described as in the main an endeavour to meet the difficulty which it causes. Briefly the solution which the Oral Theory offers is that the Synoptic Gospels correspond to the setting forth of the Life and Work of Christ in the first proclamation of the Gospel to Jew and Gentile, and in the more elementary instruction of the members of the Church, while the Gospel according to St. John embodies aspects which could not be appreciated till Christian experience had become matured.

But although Dr. Ewald has not done justice to the amount of thought that has been already expended upon this problem, we are thankful to him for having called attention to it afresh. He has rightly directed us, in study-

ing the Synoptic Question, to view it in connexion with wider questions as to the preservation and delivery of the facts of the life of Christ in the Church of the Apostolic and sub-Apostolic Age. He has fixed our thoughts upon the circumstances in which the Gospels were written, as furnishing the conditions which determined their form. And he has given clearly and definitely his own account of the matter; and has so raised the question to be discussed in a way very favourable to the progress of truth. It may fairly be demanded of any critic in such a case that he should place before us a theory. For it may well be that no theory could be devised altogether free from difficulties, and that our choice must in great measure be decided by considering which is burthened with the fewest.

What amount of favour Dr. Ewald's theory has met with in Germany I do not know. But the approval which Dr. Sanday has accorded to it has given it importance amongst ourselves, and alone makes it worth while for us to examine it carefully.

A general idea of Dr. Ewald's special theory may be obtained from Dr. Sanday's article in *THE EXPOSITOR* for February, 1891, especially p. 187. But it is necessary that I should state it somewhat more fully than Dr. Sanday has done.

His view, then, is that the limitations of the Synoptic narrative are due not to any cause which generally, or very widely, influenced the mode in which the narrative was delivered from the first; but to causes strictly local and particular which intervened at a later stage. While the Johannine type of narrative had been as fully at first the common possession of the Church as the rest, a shrinkage in the current tradition had in a certain Church or Churches taken place, and from the quarter in which this had happened the Synoptic Gospels emanated. Reminiscences of the teaching of individual men, and documents of a partial

nature which were not originally designed to be regarded as anything else than partial, were the chief sources at the command of the first three Evangelists. These sources had, moreover, already by the authority which they possessed caused the body of tradition which lay outside them to be less highly regarded and gradually forgotten in the immediate surroundings of these writers. "One must think of a branch separating itself, in consequence of special circumstances, from the main stream of tradition, which branch, on account more particularly of the authoritative position of those who brought about this separation, drove into the background the rest of the material,¹ at least for certain Church districts, and concentrated attention and general interest on itself. In other words, one must suppose one or more sources—and be it understood "written ones—not of properly Original-Gospel-character (*Unverangeliumscharakter*), proceeding from an influential quarter" (*Hauptproblem*, p. 24).

In tracing out this process in detail, Dr. Ewald has employed the hypotheses as to the sources of the Gospels which, in their general outlines, have approved themselves of late to many investigators, though he has examined the subject for himself, and come to his own conclusions on individual points. Papias's account of the composition of the Gospel according to St. Mark—that it resulted from the writing down by St. Mark of what St. Peter delivered—he accepts as substantially correct. But he forms his own idea of the nature of St. Peter's instruction. St. Peter, he imagines, was accustomed to dwell with peculiar fondness on the incidents of the Galilean ministry; and this partiality of the Apostle's came to be reflected in the work

¹ It is a little difficult to conceive one stream driving another stream, and more particularly the main river from which it has been drawn off, into the background. But if this slight confusion of metaphors is condoned, the general meaning will be clear enough.

of his reporter. "The author's own contribution was confined to arrangement. 'Favourite reminiscences of Peter's, from the time when he himself companied with Jesus in Galilee and on the way to Jerusalem, put together in some scenes and edited by Mark'—thus would a modern writer have formulated the title" (*ib.*, p. 26). I may add that Dr. Ewald supposes *vv.* 1–3 of chapter i. to be a later addition, so that, if the last twelve verses are also later and replaced no other ending, there was no very formal beginning or close to the book as it proceeded from the hand of St. Mark.

Its connexion with St. Peter gave to this document great authority, and led to that neglect of other traditions, not similarly authenticated, which Dr. Ewald supposes. Within the sphere of this influence, then, the first and third Gospels were written. He hazards the conjecture that Italy may have been the country where all three saw the light. "There, too, there were Jewish Christians to whom the writer of the first might have turned" (*ib.*, p. 223, note).

The writer of our first Gospel had, however, some additional sources of information. There was a Collection of Discourses which the Apostle Matthew had compiled, and almost the entire substance of this work (Dr. Ewald holds) has passed into our first Gospel, and to a considerable extent in the same form. The "onesidedness" which may be charged against this document also, he would in part deny, in part account for by the plan of the collection. It consisted almost entirely of discourses put together to illustrate under different aspects the nature of the Kingdom of Heaven. They were arranged with regard to their subject-matter and with very slight connecting links and the barest notices, where any, of the occasion of delivery. The fourth part, according to his idea of the scheme, had for subject the Lord and King of the Kingdom, and this has "a Johannine colouring throughout." But at all events this

work by St. Matthew neither gave, nor was designed to give, any general view of the Saviour's Ministry, which could have caused difficulty by its difference from that of the Fourth Gospel. At the same time its character was not such as to save Evangelists who used it from producing this result by their own writings.

We have yet to add in respect to the *third* Evangelist, that Dr. Ewald does not think it possible that his Gospel can have been derived solely from the two Apostolic or quasi-Apostolic documents which have been thus far spoken of, or from these in conjunction with our first Gospel, in which those two documents had been already once worked up. Many critics have assumed that the large amount of matter peculiar to St. Luke, and contained especially in the "Great Interpolation" (chaps. ix. 51-xviii. 14), was taken from St. Matthew's *Collection of Discourses*. Dr. Ewald is, however, of opinion that the third Evangelist found these narratives for the most part in a separate document, and the Evangelist may also, he allows, have derived a little from tradition. This third document apparently happened to be "onesided" too; while in his own researches into tradition, though he can hardly have failed to come across narratives of a Johannine type, St. Luke was restrained from inserting them by the spell which his documents exercised either directly over his own mind, or mediately through the effect which they had already had in the Christian circle in which he was living.

Such is the theory. I proceed to state the objections to it which occur to me, and which appear to me to be fatal to it. I will then, in conclusion, make a few remarks upon the older explanation of the phenomena for which it attempts to account.

1. To suppose that St. Peter was influenced, to the extent which the theory requires, in the selection of the subjects of his teaching, by the fondness of an old man's

memory, is to attribute to him a temper unworthy of the seriousness of his purpose and of his character. Dr. Sanday, indeed, in reproducing Dr. Ewald's view, suggests simply that, "what the whole Church could not omit, what the whole body of the Apostles could not omit, that a single apostle—not sitting down deliberately to write history, but merely from time to time choosing his subjects for edification—might very well fail to mention" (EXPOSITOR, p. 187). But the same considerations which determined St. Peter's selection may well have told also upon the minds of other teachers. Nor does the collection of narratives in St. Mark's Gospel or their arrangement seem to have that unsystematic and fortuitous character which would alone agree with Dr. Ewald's and Dr. Sanday's conception of its source.

2. The supposed shrinkage in the volume of tradition is a wholly unnatural process. It can well be understood that after dwelling chiefly at first on the simpler aspects of the Ministry of Jesus and of His office as the Christ, men should pass on to a livelier sense of His Divine Majesty and their minds become more occupied than before with those of His deeds and discourses which illustrated it. But to imagine that the inverse of this took place is to defy at once the laws according to which the human mind might be expected to work, and all the indications which we possess of the actual history of Christian thought. One party indeed, under the influence of Jewish prejudices, not only stood still, but, separating themselves from the general body and becoming the Ebionite sect, or sects, retrograded. But that a particular Church, or region of the Christian world, should have undergone a change in any sort analogous to this, not from any dogmatic motive, but while remaining, or desiring to remain, in true fellowship with all other Christians, and solely in consequence of the effect upon them of one or more documents, which were never

intended to produce such a result, seems to be in the highest degree improbable.

3. This difficulty becomes specially apparent when an attempt is made to fix upon the quarter of the world where the assumed conditions can be supposed to have been realised. Dr. Ewald himself has suggested Italy. But the whole of Italy felt to a considerable extent the influence of Rome. And when we remember how in the first century, as afterwards, visitors from all parts, Christians as well as others, were continually coming to Rome, and how a thrill from what was thought and done in every region of the world was experienced there, it is impossible to suppose that in the Church of Rome, or in any portion of Italy, the kind of isolation which the theory supposes can have been maintained. It is also not a little inconsistent that, for instance, the Epistle of St. Clement of Rome should be referred to by Dr. Ewald to prove the existence of a Johannine as well as a Synoptic cycle of tradition. That, I believe, it does; but then what becomes of Dr. Ewald's special hypothesis? For, according to it, St. Clement was a contemporary, hardly, if at all, even a younger contemporary, of the first and third Evangelists, and was destined soon to become, if he was not already, the most prominent person in the very Church in the neighbourhood, or in the midst, of which their Gospels were composed. Nor can any other birthplace for the Gospels more favourable to Dr. Ewald be thought of. All three Gospels being intended for Greek-speaking readers, and two of them being specially suited to Gentiles, Palestine and Syria are out of the question. Asia Minor was the region of St. John's special influence. Alexandria and Greece remain; but the situation and character of neither of these would have encouraged the formation of a distinctive type of narrative of the kind supposed, in the closing decades of the first century.

As Dr. Ewald has appealed to the early Christian extra-

canonical writers, and rightly so, for the traces they contain of acquaintance with the Johannine type of teaching, it should be remarked that the evidence of these writers at the same time tends to establish the fact that even in their generation most prominence was given to the synoptic form of the tradition. Let any one say, for instance, whether that is not his clear impression after reading Dr. Sanday's sketch of the facts of the Gospel history, as they may be drawn from the works of Justin Martyr (pp. 91-98 of *Gospels in the Second Century*, comparing also discussion of quotations from St. John, *ib.*, pp. 278-).

4. While it is difficult to imagine the existence anywhere of the assumed circumstances, it is perhaps still more difficult to believe that such purely local influences could have restrained the Evangelists in the performance of their work. It is evident in particular with regard to the author of the third Gospel, that he set about his task in an independent spirit. Moreover if there is strong reason for believing (as I hope to show in a future paper) that he was the actual companion of St. Paul who speaks in the first person plural in certain portions of the narrative of St. Paul's journeyings in the Acts of the Apostles, then he had not only visited Macedonia and Asia Minor and Italy, but Palestine itself, and had probably stayed there a considerable time during St. Paul's imprisonment in Cæsarea. How could a comparatively late and local narrowing of the tradition commonly delivered be felt to be binding by such a man?

5. Lastly, it would be exceedingly strange that three Gospels which emanated from a church-district in which the ancient tradition was delivered with less fulness than elsewhere should have attained to the position which not long afterwards they did in the Church as a whole.

The failure of this new attempt to explain the limitations—as in view of the Fourth Gospel they must be termed

—which characterise the first three Gospels in common, drives us back to consider afresh whether those who have traced them to the operation of the Oral Teaching of the early Christian preachers and teachers, have not indicated on the whole the most probable cause, even if they may have attributed too much to it, and sometimes created unnecessary difficulties by the particular form they have given to their hypothesis.

It has commonly been put forward as a part of the Oral Theory, that the Oral Gospel took shape within the circle of the Twelve Apostles, during a period when they lived together almost continuously in Jerusalem, while making at most only brief missionary excursions from it. And objectors have seized upon this as a special point of attack. It has been thought impossible that if St. John was present and bore his share in fashioning the common tradition, it would have been left wanting in all those incidents and discourses which, as the case stands, are peculiar to his Gospel. Moreover, it is said, associated as these narratives must have been in their minds with the very scenes with which at the time supposed the Apostles were surrounded, they could not have omitted them.

It does not appear to me to be necessary to connect the formulating of the tradition specially with Jerusalem. A process is to be imagined which was informal and undesignated. The minds of the twelve and their fellow-workers were filled to a remarkable degree with the same thoughts and aims, and they had work to do for a considerable period among very similar people. They had, also, doubtless a sufficient degree of intercourse with one another to allow of the example of the more forcible characters telling upon the rest. Few of them were men capable intellectually of striking out independent courses. Without any regular discussions, and for the most part through unconscious imitation, and the subtle action of one mind upon another,

their habits of teaching would be moulded after a common pattern. With regard to the possibility that a certain outline of teaching might become established in some such way, it should be remembered that in the formulation and general adoption of the Creed, we seem to have a very similar phenomenon.

Further, it is not clear that St. John must at that early period have exerted a decisive influence, or that if he had done so, the result would have been the introduction into the current popular teaching of the elements preserved in his Gospel. He was probably the youngest of the Apostolic band, and he appears to have been one of those men of reflective, meditative minds, who are only slowly brought to the point of speech and action.

In order that justice may be done to the conception of an Oral Gospel, which resembled in its general features the narratives of the Synoptists—whether Jerusalem was, or was not, its birthplace—the most essential point to be kept in mind is, that it is not to be thought of as the result of a collaboration undertaken for the purpose of delivering a *biography* of our Lord, with the chronological arrangement and relative completeness which naturally marks even a biographical sketch. The object of the Apostles in their preaching was to set forth the mission of Jesus as the Christ, and His credentials. They were primarily, as has been often said, witnesses to His resurrection. But it was clearly necessary also, even in order that the significance of His resurrection itself might be understood, that something should be told of His wonderful words and works—the ministry which ended in His Passion—together with the preparation made for His coming by His great forerunner.

That teachers having this end before them should, after speaking of the Baptist's work, have passed straight to the opening of our Lord's Ministry in Galilee, omitting that

work in Judæa which was contemporaneous with the last weeks or months before the Baptist's imprisonment, is surely not strange. Even from St. John's Gospel we should infer that our Lord's action was during that time restrained by fear of the appearance of competition with the Baptist (see reason given for leaving Judæa, John iv. 3, and note of time, iii. 24), and consequently had something of a preliminary nature. Further, we can understand why the sayings and miracles with which, in the popular teaching, the character of "the Prophet mighty in word and deed" was illustrated, were chosen from the Galilean ministry. A real development is indeed to be observed in the Lord's self-revelation, and in its effects upon the people even here. Certain turning-points are marked. There is a life-like progress with which the narrative moves towards and reaches its close. But to have taken up the other thread as well, of His manifestation of Himself in Judæa, and the judgment which different individuals and classes passed upon themselves by their attitude towards Him there, would have destroyed the simplicity and clearness of the representation and of its lessons. Moreover, the intellectual temper and the spiritual needs of most hearers of the Apostles were more nearly analogous to those of the people whom our Lord taught in Galilee than to those of the Scribes and Pharisees of Jerusalem. They were not prepared for the consideration of His disputes with the latter, or of those mysterious truths concerning His essential oneness with the Father and mystic relation to men on which He dwelt in some of the discourses to His disciples, which are recorded in the Fourth Gospel.

We believe that this deeper view of His Person was involved even in the simpler teaching, and that, in accordance with the representation of the Fourth Gospel, He Himself had anticipated the questions on this subject which must in any case have in time suggested themselves. But

many lines of evidence, as well as the natural order of thought, point to the conclusion that it was not at first dwelt upon by the Apostles in their preaching, and that Christ's own language with regard to it, and the incidents with which that language was specially associated, were only drawn forth into prominence towards the close of the Apostolic age. This view is not to be disposed of simply by the assertion that for it to hold "the Apostles themselves must all have slumbered, and not merely their reminiscences" (Ewald, p. 131). It agrees with the conception which Robert Browning has formed of the history of St. John's mind, as shown in the passage where he represents the aged Apostle explaining how he met the questionings and errors that grew more rife with his advancing years.

"Patient I stated much of the Lord's life
 Forgotten or misdelivered, and let it work :
 Since much that at the first, in deed and word,
 Lay simply and sufficiently exposed,
 Had grown (or else my soul was grown to match,
 Fed through such years, familiar with such light,
 Guarded and guided still to see and speak)
 Of new significance and fresh result ;
 What first were guessed as points, I now knew stars,
 And named them in the Gospel I have writ."¹

A process which this great student and master of the working of the human mind has thus described, cannot be regarded as impossible or improbable. It will be found to be—I venture to think—the only satisfactory way of reconciling the truth of St. John's Gospel with other facts in regard to the early faith and teaching of the Church.

The characteristics of the Synoptic Gospels constitute one of the most striking of these facts. The writers of the Gospels must, we imagine, have had a somewhat different aim from the preachers, whose teaching was the first stage in the delivery of the Gospel. The authors of the written

¹ *A Death in the Desert.*

Gospels, in all probability, regarded their work somewhat more as that of biographers. Still the general form under which the Saviour's life had been presented to them by those who "from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" would exercise a peculiar influence over their minds. A determining cause of this kind is commonly admitted in the case of the second Gospel, inasmuch as Papias's account of St. Mark's dependence upon St. Peter is accepted; though it may be questioned whether the Evangelist did not also call his more general knowledge of the teaching delivered in the Church to the aid of his memory of St. Peter's words, and rely besides in some measure upon the customary form of this tradition for guidance in the arrangement of his matter.

As I have already said, I myself believe that the second Gospel, or a Gospel substantially the same, was used by the writers of our third Gospel and of our Greek Gospel according to St. Matthew.¹ The authority with which such a document was necessarily invested goes far, doubtless, to explain the adoption of the same plan, and often of the same words by these other two Evangelists. But it does not seem sufficient by itself, in view of the amount of independence which they also display. Their adherence to their predecessor, however, becomes easier to understand, if the character of St. Mark's outline harmonised with the form of teaching to which they were otherwise accustomed. Dr. Ewald has felt it necessary to assume that this was the case, but he has regarded it as a purely local circumstance of late origin. We have seen however how grave the objections to that hypothesis are; and it seems less difficult to justify the belief that the type of teaching by which the spell was cast was an early and widely prevalent one, to which St. Peter's own preaching had conformed.

¹ I cannot here enter into the question of the relation of this Gospel to the Hebrew or Aramaic work.

One word in conclusion as to the bearing of this discussion on our conception of the relations of the Gospels to one another in their highest aspect as sources of Divine knowledge. Christians have learned from an early time to speak and think of a "fourfold" Gospel. To speak more strictly and fully, we have a "twofold" Gospel, though the first division opens out into three subdivisions, the common point of view of the first three being qualified in the case of each of them by important individual characteristics. On the present occasion we have been mainly concerned with the limitations common to the first three. According to the account of the matter which has been adopted in this paper, these were the consequence of the fact that they have preserved to us the more popular and elementary instruction in the Church of the first days, concerning the mission of the Christ, which was designed to meet a real need then, and one that has not ceased to be felt. Such an account of the origin of these limitations seems not only, as I have endeavoured to show, far more probable, but also far worthier of the position which these records were destined to fill, than one which traces them to the idiosyncrasy of a single Church or region, where the fragmentariness of the teaching of a single apostle, and the partly superstitious reverence for a document founded upon it, had, late in the first century, produced a certain narrowness of view.

V. H. STANTON.

*THE PREFACE TO THE FIRST EPISTLE
OF JOHN.*

THIS is a homiletical Epistle, the address of an absent pastor to his flock, or to disciples widely scattered and beyond the reach of his voice. Substitute the word "say" in certain sentences for "write," and one might conceive the whole discourse addressed by word of mouth to the

assembled church. It is a specimen of apostolic preaching to believers, a master-piece in the art of edification. Assuming that the book of the Apocalypse proceeds from the same apostle and divine, and that "the seven churches that are in Asia" to which he there writes, formed the field of the later ministry of St. John, we naturally infer that the destination of this Epistle lay in the same region. The forms of Gnostic error to which in various passages the writer refers, originated, we have reason to believe, in the churches of this province and were growing rife at the close of the first century.¹

The address is based on the gospel history, which it presupposes throughout. Some have thought the Epistle written on purpose to accompany St. John's Gospel, in order to serve as its practical application and enforcement. The two lie so near to each other in their cast of thought and dialect and are connected by so many turns of expression, that it is evident they are the outcome of the same mind and, we may safely say, of the same stage and state of mind. Yet in addressing his "little children," the apostle refers surely not to a written book, but to his personal testimony to the Son of God, to the teaching they had received from his own lips and which was printed on their memory and heart. To this familiar and oft-repeated witness of the disciple whom Jesus loved—a witness embodied for us in the Fourth Gospel—the opening words of the letter relate. The preface to the Epistle is, in effect, a summary of the Gospel according to John, as we see at once when we compare it with the opening and closing words of that narrative (John i. 1-18, xx. 30, 31). The revelation of God through His Son Jesus Christ, a revelation entirely human and apprehended already by his

¹ The opening *Discourses* of Bishop Alexander's Commentary on *The Epistles of St. John* (Expositor's Bible) give a rich and vivid historical setting to this Epistle.

readers, is that which the writer desires to communicate and set forth in its living effect. This revelation is the spring of a new eternal life for all men, a life of fellowship with God Himself, in which St. John would fain make his fellows sharers with him.

It is this Preface that we have now to consider, consisting of chapter i. 1-4. Its subject is *the eternal life manifested*.

We adopt the revised translation of these four verses, preferring, however, in verse 1 the marginal "*word of life*," without the capital. For it is on *life*¹ rather than *word* that the stress of the sentence lies ("for the life was manifested," John continues); and Word must have stood alone to be recognised as a personal title, or could at most be qualified as it is in the Apocalypse (xix. 13): "His name is called the Word of God." John's "*word of life*" resembles the "*word of life*" that Paul bids the Philipians "*hold forth*" (ii. 16), "*the words of life eternal*" which Peter declared his Master to possess (John vi. 68), and "*all the words of this life*" which the apostles were bidden to "*speak in the temple to the people*" (Acts v. 20). It is synonymous with "*the gospel*," the message of the new life which those bear witness to and report who have first "*heard*" it and proved its living power. "*Concerning the word of life*" stands in apposition to the four preceding relative clauses ("*that which we have heard . . . our hands handled*") and states their general subject-matter and import; while the first clause, "*That which was from the beginning*," stands alone in its sublime completeness. The verse may be read by itself, as furnishing a title to the writing, a statement of the great theme of the writer's thoughts and that which forms the basis of his relations with his readers. He speaks of

¹ Comp. *bread of life*; *light of life*; *way, truth and life*, etc., in the Gospel.

“That which was from the beginning :
That which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes,
That which we beheld and our hands handled :
Concerning the word of life.”

Construing the first verse thus, we dispense with the brackets enclosing the second in our English Version. Parentheses and involved constructions are not after St. John's style. The common punctuation throws the second verse into the shade ; and treats it as a mere aside, an idea striking the writer casually and by the way, an eddy in the current, whereas it belongs to the mid-stream of his thought. The sentence contains, in fact, the main assertion of the passage. And while verse 3 links itself with verse 1, repeating its second line, it does so with a difference, and with a scope beyond the intent of the former sentence. St. John reiterates “what we have seen and heard” not by way of resuming the thread of an interrupted statement, but striking once more, and for a third time, the key-note, on which he plays a further descant. We observe here, at the outset, the peculiar manner of our author. His thought progresses by a circular, or spiral movement, returning continually upon itself, but in each revolution advancing to a new point and giving a larger aspect and bearing to the idea that it seeks to unfold.

“Declare,” in verses 2 and 3 more precisely understood, signifies “report” (*ἀπαγγέλλομεν*). It is the carrying of tidings or messages from the authentic source : “what we have seen and heard we report also to you” (comp. ver. 5) —we are the bearers to you of the word we received from Him. So in verse 2 : “we bear witness and report” ; where, as Haupt acutely says, in the former expression the emphasis lies on the communication of *truth*, in the latter on the *communication* of truth.

Readers of the Greek will note the expressive transition from the perfect to the aorist tense and back again, that

takes place in verses 1-3. When John writes, "that which we *have heard*" and "*have seen* with our eyes," he asserts the abiding reality of the audible and visible manifestation of God in Christ. This is now the fixed possession of himself and of his readers, the past realized in the present; and to this immovable certainty he reverts once and again in verses 2 and 3. The sudden change of tense in the middle of verse 1, missed by our authorized translation, carries us back to the historical fact. We stand with the apostle in memory before the incarnate Son of God, gazing with wonder on His face and reaching out our hands to touch His form, as he writes, "that which *we beheld and our hands handled.*" This turn of thought is a fine trait of genuineness. It is the movement of personal remembrance working within and behind historical reflexion. "Handle me and see," the risen Jesus had said, "for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having" (Luke xxiv. 39). Looking with John's eyes upon this mysterious Person, feeling and grasping with his hands its flesh and blood reality, and pondering its meaning, we say with him: "The life was manifested, the eternal life that was with the Father, was manifested to us." While *ἐθεασάμεθα* (*we beheld*) implies an intent contemplative gaze, *ἐψηλάφησαν*, occurring, in the New Testament, only in Acts xvii. 27 and Hebrews xii. 18 beside these two passages, denotes not the bare *handling*, but the searching, exploring use of the hands, that *tests by handling*.

So much for the verbal elucidation of the passage. Let us look at its substantial content.

I. St. John had witnessed, as he believed, the supreme manifestation of God. The secret of the universe stood unveiled before his eyes, the everlasting fact and truth of things, the reality underlying all appearances, "that which *was from the beginning.*" Here he touched the spring of being, the principle that animates creation from star to

farthest star, from the archangel to the worm in the sod: "the life was manifested, the life eternal which existed with the Father, was manifested to us." If "the life" of this passage is identical with that of the Gospel prologue, it has all this breadth of meaning; it receives a limitless extension when it is defined as "that which was from the beginning."

The source of spiritual life to men is that which was, in the first instance, the source of natural life to all creatures. Here lies the foundation of St. John's theology. It assumes the solidarity of being, the unity of the seen and unseen. It contradicts and excludes, from the outset, all Gnostical, dualistic and docetic, conceptions of the world. This essential and aboriginal life, he tells us, became incarnate, that it may have fellowship with men; it was slain, that its blood may cleanse them from iniquity—for the cross is not far off, we shall find it in the next paragraph.

The sublime prelude of St. John's Gospel, "In the beginning was the Word," is not repeated here; it is assumed. *In the beginning* gives the starting-point of revelation: *from the beginning* carries us along its process. Throughout the creation and course of the natural universe, through the calling and history of ancient Israel and the former dispensations, the Word wrought and spoke "from the beginning," shaping itself into a message of life for men; and the incarnate revelation was its goal. It is the fourth verse, rather than the first of the Gospel, which supplies the text for the Epistle: "that which hath come to be, in Him was life; and the life was the light of men." (R.V. margin.) A stream running underground, while the roots of a thousand plants drink of its strength, and verdure and beauty mark out its hidden course; the electric current, most potent and subtle of inorganic forces, that runs silent and unsuspected through long dark and winding channels, till it reaches the carbon-points where it bursts into sudden light

and splendour—these are imperfect images of the disclosure of God in Christ, as St. John views it in its relation to the anterior ages. It was “the mystery,” as St. Paul expressed it, “hidden from times eternal,”—God’s secret lying deep at the heart of the ages, lodged and wrapped up in the world from its foundation, till it came to birth in the Virgin’s Son.

Such, in the first place, was *the life* coming from the Father, that was manifested to the eyes of the witnesses of Jesus, the one life and love that runs through all things, the source and root of being.

II. In the second place, observe the energy with which the apostle asserts *the actuality* of the manifestation of the life of God in Jesus Christ. Thrice in three verses he reiterates, “we have seen” it, twice “we have heard”; and twice he repeats, “the life was manifested.”

This stupendous fact has, naturally, always had its doubters and deniers. In any age of the world, and under any system of thought, such a revelation as that made in Jesus Christ was sure to be met with incredulity. It is equally opposed to the superstitions and to the scepticisms natural to the human mind. In truth, the mind that is not surprised and sometimes staggered by the claims of Christ and the doctrines of Christianity, that has not felt the shock they give to our ordinary experience and native convictions, has hardly awakened yet to their full import. The hesitation arising, like that of Thomas at the Resurrection, from a sense of the overwhelming magnitude, the tremendous significance of the facts asserted, is worthier than a facile and unthinking faith, which swallows enormous theological propositions without any sense of difficulty and treats the deepest mysteries of religion as a commonplace.

St. John feels that the things he declares demand the strongest evidence. He has not believed them lightly, and

he does not expect others to believe them lightly. This passage, like many besides in the New Testament record, goes to show that the apostles were well aware of the importance of historical truth; they were conscientious and jealously observant in regard to this cardinal requirement. Their faith was calm, rational and sagacious. They were perfectly certain of the things they attested, and believed only upon commanding and irresistible proof, that covered the whole extent of the case,—evidence natural and supernatural, external and internal, sensible and moral, scriptural and experimental, and practically demonstrative. But the facts they built their faith upon are so largely of the spiritual order, that without a corresponding spiritual sense and faculty they can never be absolutely convincing.

Already, in St. John's old age, the solvents of philosophical analysis were being applied to the gospel history and doctrine. The Godhead incarnate, the manifestation of the infinite in the finite, of the eternal in the temporal, was pronounced impossible and self-contradictory; we know beforehand, the wise of the world said, that it cannot be. And so criticism sets itself to work upon the story in the interests of a false philosophy. The incarnation, the miracles, the resurrection, the ascension,—what are they but a myth, a beautiful poetic dream, a pictorial representation of spiritual truth, from which we must extract for ourselves a higher creed, leaving behind all the supernatural as so much mere wrappage and imaginative dress! This we hear proclaimed loudly to-day; and this the Gnostics of the later apostolic age were already, in their peculiar method and dialect, beginning to make out.

So the Apostle John confronts them, and their like in every time, with his impressive and authoritative declaration. Behind him lies the whole weight of the character, intelligence and disciplined experience of the witnesses of Jesus. Of what use was it for men at a distance to argue

that this thing and that thing could not be? "I tell you," says the great apostle, "we have seen it with our eyes, we have heard Him with our very ears; we have touched and tested and handled these things at every point, and we know that they are so." As he puts it, at the end of his letter, "we *know* that the Son of God is come; and He hath given us *an understanding* that we may know Him that is true." The men who have founded Christianity and written the New Testament, were no fools. They knew what they were talking about. No dreamer, no fanatic, no deceiver, since the world began, ever wrote like the author of this Epistle. Every physical sense, every critical faculty of a sound and manly understanding, every honest conviction of the heart, every most searching and fiery test that can try the spirit of man combines to assure us that the apostles of Jesus Christ have told us the truth as they knew it about Him, and that things were even as they said and no otherwise. Ay, and God has borne witness to these faithful men through the ages since and has put His seal to their testimony, or you and I would not be speaking of these things to-day.

III. And now, in the third place, there is founded upon the facts thus attested, there is derived from the eternal life revealed in Christ, *a new divine fellowship for men*. To promote this end St. John writes: "that you also may have fellowship with us." To communicate these truths, to see this fellowship established and perfected amongst men, is the apostle's one delight, the business and delight of all those who share his faith and serve his Master: "these things we write, that *our joy* may be fulfilled."

We have a great secret in common, we and the apostles. The Father told it to Jesus, Jesus to them, they to us, and we to others. Those who have seen and heard such things, cannot keep the knowledge to themselves. These truths belong not to us only, but to "the whole world"

(ii. 2); they concern every man who has a soul to save, who has sins to confess and death to meet, who has work to do for his Maker in this world and a way to find for himself through its darkness and perils.

The Apostle John is writing to Greeks, to men far removed from him in native sympathy and instinct; but he has long since forgotten all that, and the difference between Jew and Greek never once crosses his mind in writing his letter. He has risen above it and left it behind through his fellowship with Christ. The only difference he knows is that existing between men who "are of God" and men who "are of the world." In St. John the idea of the Church catholic as a spiritual brotherhood is perfected. He heads the grand procession of the confessors of Jesus, which marches along unbroken through the ages, gathering into its ordered and swelling ranks all that earth holds of goodliest and greatest. In that glorious array we rejoice to find our place; in our turn we sing its songs, and repeat its undying witness.

But our fellowship is not with them alone—with prophets, apostles, martyrs, saints of God. We do not hold with the apostle merely such fellowship as we have with other great minds of the past; nor was John's communion with his Lord that which we cherish with our beloved dead, the communion of memory, or at best of hope. If the facts the apostles attest are true, they are true for us as for them. If the life manifested in the Lord Jesus was eternal, then it is living and real to-day. As it "was from the beginning," it will be to the end. Jesus Christ had brought His disciples into spiritual union and fellowship with the living God. He had shown them the Father. He had made them individually children of God, with Himself for elder brother. He had passed away from their sight, to be with them for ever in His Spirit. In this way He had really *come* to them, and the Father with Him, when He

seemed to be going (John xiv. 18-23: R.V.). They felt themselves to be in direct communion and communication, every day they lived, with the Almighty Father in heaven, and with His Son Jesus Christ whom they had known and loved on earth. To this fellowship they invite and summon all mankind.

The manifestation of God in Christ makes fellowship with God possible in an altogether new and richer way. Does not the very distinction revealed in the Godhead render such communion accessible, as it could not be otherwise to human thought? The children in the house understand father *and* mother better than they could do either of them alone; they learn to know each through the other. "Our communion," writes John, "is with the Father, and with His Son Jesus Christ,"—with each distinctly, with each in and through and for the other. We have fellowship with Christ in the Father. He has explained the Father (John i. 18), and talked to us about Him; and we are entering into His views. We share Christ's thoughts about God. We begin to think and feel, in our poor finite, struggling way, about the Almighty Father as He does in His grand and perfect and everlasting way. "My Father and your Father," He condescends to say, as He steps upward to heaven. Believing this assurance, we have fellowship with Jesus Christ, God's Son; for we also are God's sons. God is to us, and life is to us, in some degree, what they were, and are, to our adorable Redeemer.

On the other hand, we have fellowship with God in the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ is God's; but He is ours as well! God has told us what He thinks about His Son, and wishes us to think with Him. Showing Him to the world, He says: "This is My Son, the Beloved, in whom I am ever well pleased." And we agree to that: we are well pleased with Him too! We solemnly accept the testimony of God concerning His Son. Then we are at

one with God in respect to Christ. And all harmony and peace centre there. So far as we know or can understand, there is nothing that occupies the mind of God so deeply, and touches so vitally His relations with the creatures, as the kingdom and honour of His Son Jesus Christ; there is nothing that pleases Him so much as our attachment to Christ. "The Father Himself loveth you," said Jesus to His disciples, "because you have loved Me, and believed that I came out from the Father." In Him God is reconciling the world to Himself. Upon faith in Him our individual destiny turns,—and the fate of society and nations. Only when we think aright of Christ are we in unison with God. Only when we think aright of Christ and are rightly disposed toward Him, can we have fellowship with each other, and work together with God for the world's redemption.

Life, manifestation, fellowship: these three words resume the teaching of the first paragraph of the Epistle.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

WELLHAUSEN'S "MINOR PROPHETS." ¹

It must be confessed that there is something disappointing in the appearance presented by this book when one first opens it. The translation of the prophetic writings begins on the first page without a word of preface or introduction, and at the end of the translation the notes on the several books are found. To English readers this cannot but appear abrupt. They miss the help which is afforded by a general statement of the author's aims and views. They prefer to see the relations between the several parts of a work like this explicitly set forth. To the latter point it will be

¹ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*. Von J. Wellhausen, Fünftes Heft. *Die Kleinen Propheten*. Uebersetzt, mit Noten. Berlin: Georg Reimer.

necessary to return almost immediately; meanwhile we content ourselves with acknowledging that Wellhausen is not alone in following this method,¹ and that the position of this volume in the series of *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* goes some way towards justifying the course pursued.

Merely to mention the prominent features which characterize *Die Kleinen Propheten* would be an unprofitable procedure. At the risk of dealing with it in what may seem a fragmentary manner, we must content ourselves with indicating the chronological order which has been adopted, and selecting a few instances of textual criticism and exposition.

I. The order in which the minor prophets here stand is as follows: Amos, Hosea, Micah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, Obadiah, Joel.² Amos, then, stands first and Joel last in the "goodly fellowship of the prophets." The present writer believes this to be correct, but it is not yet universally admitted. To say nothing of English authors, the Reuss-Erichson version of the Old Testament, which is now being published in Germany, upholds, though with some hesitation, the priority of Joel. And this is a subject which we should have liked to see fully discussed in *Die Kleinen Propheten*. The notes on Joel do indeed point out the dependence of this prophet on the second part of Zechariah and on Ezekiel, a fact which of itself evinces the lateness of his date. But we miss that full and impressive exhibition of the reasons for believing that Joel wrote not much, if any, earlier than 400 B.C. which Wellhausen could have given—the omission of all mention of a king, with the assumption that the initiative rests with priests and elders; the con-

¹ Kautzsch's *Bibelwerk*, now appearing, is constructed on similar lines.

² On Jonah, see below. Except that the positions occupied by Zephaniah and Nahum are reversed, the same chronological scheme is adopted in the new translation which is now appearing under the editorship of Kautzsch.

centration of the prophet's attention on the South, in a manner which is best explained on the ground that the Northern Kingdom no longer exists; the language of such passages as iv. 1-7, which can hardly refer to a smaller calamity than that of the Exile; the mention of Jerusalem as a sanctuary, which fits best the troublous experiences after the return from Babylon; the sentiment of ii. 16, compared with the Post-Exilic Psalm li. And when we remember how confidently it has been stated that Amos i. 2 is an imitation of Joel iii. 16, we feel that the relation between the two needs to be clearly understood. Perhaps the comparison of Amos i. 2 with the section that follows, extending from i. 3 to ii. 5, will elucidate the point. Obviously the verse in question is meant to serve as a title to or summary of the section. As obviously it does not serve this end. The drought which burns up the pastures near Tekoa and withers the foliage of Carmel has no connexion with the punishments inflicted on Damascus, Gaza, or Moab. The editor of the Minor Prophets, when they were incorporated in the canon, thinking that the cycle of denunciations required an exordium, built up this verse out of Joel's phraseology, and that with all the greater ease because he found points of connexion in Amos iii. 4, ix. 3.

In Orelli's interesting commentary on the Minor Prophets few things were so unsatisfactory as his declaration that Obadiah occupies the first position chronologically and should be read first. Stronger arguments than his would be required to set aside the apparently direct reference of *vv.* 10-16 to the overwhelming calamity of the destruction of temple and city by Nebuchadnezzar. And two noteworthy considerations are adduced by Wellhausen. He points out that the language in which the injuries inflicted on Edom are described implies that the spoilers were small nomadic tribes. And he traces succinctly the course of that nomadic movement which began in the sixth century B.C.

and reached its climax in the settlement of the Arabs in Petra at any rate before 312 B.C.

There is no special novelty in the treatment of Jonah. "It is a legend, a narrative in the style of the Midrash." Its object, we are told, was to still the impatience of the members of the theocracy, who could not understand God's longsuffering with the heathen. Dr. C. H. H. Wright¹ appears to regard this view as inconsistent with "a belief in the Divine inspiration and authority of the book." But it is difficult to understand why a parable written with a didactic purpose should be less divine than a "propheticohistorical allegory" which is admitted to be *not historical*. Budde's article in Stade's *Zeitschrift*, 1892, p. 37 ff., referred to by Wellhausen, is well worth reading.

II. For the most part it will be impossible to keep separate our discussion of the textual alterations and the expositions contained in the book before us. The former so often depend on exegetical considerations, and the latter are so obviously determined by the former, that we must blend them in our examination of a few passages taken almost at random.

We begin with the Book of Amos. Verses 9-12 of the first chapter are omitted from the text as being an interpolation. The chief reasons for thus judging of *vv.* 9, 10 are that "the reproach addressed to Tyre is precisely the same (*ganz der gleiche*) as that against Gaza, that nothing is said of the other Phœnician States, and that the threat comes to an end without the usual concluding formula." But if the reproach were identical with that against Gaza, it is, at any rate, most suitably brought against Tyre, the Phœnicians being the great slave-dealers of antiquity. In point of fact, however, there is a difference between the two reproaches. The Tyrians are spoken of as mere middlemen, delivering up the slaves to Edom; the Philistines are

¹ *Introduction to the Old Testament*, p. 210.

represented as first raiding the country for slaves and then selling them. And why should the mention of the other Phœnician States be necessary? Tyre, now the principal State, might well represent the whole. The absence of the words with which most of the threats close is also as likely in the original writer as in an interpolator. The arguments for the omission of *vv.* 11, 12 are stronger. At so early a period as that of Amos we should have expected Sela to be mentioned rather than Tema and Bozrah. And charges of cruelty are not usually brought against Edom prior to the Chaldean period. On the other hand the cycle would not be complete without Edom. And there is a vast difference between the definiteness of the complaints at Obadiah 10-14 and Psalm cxxxvii. 7 and the indefinite and ambiguous Amos i. 11. If Edom was regularly engaged in the slave-trade, as we learn from *v.* 6 was the case, this might easily lead to sanguinary excesses. For many years Wellhausen has held the opinion which Stade expressed in the second volume of his History, that Amos ii. 4, 5 is due to a later hand. The writer of this notice shares that opinion, but not for the reasons adduced in Wellhausen's Notes. To him the conclusive reason is the expression, "And their lies caused them to err, after the which their fathers walked." Idolatry was not the sin against which Amos and his immediate successors testified. And there is a distinctly later flavour in this designation of the false gods as "lies" or "deceits."

Amos iv. 3 is the despair of textual critics and commentators. Wellhausen accepts the passive form of the verb, in accordance with the LXX. ἀπορριψήσεσθε, and leaves הָהָרִמוֹנָה untranslated. He differs, rightly, from some of his predecessors in maintaining that when the fate of the women only is being described the name of the land to which they are to be cast forth will not be mentioned. To this we may add that even when the entire nation is spoken

of Amos does not state definitely the land of their destined exile (see v. 27 and note the indefinite גֵּי of vi. 14). To make a fresh suggestion for the settlement of the text is hazardous, but might we read כִּי־אֲרַמְנִיתִיכֶן for הִהָרְמוּנָה? The word אֲרַמְנִית is characteristic of Amos. The changes required in the consonants are few and not violent. The sense, a good one in itself, is almost precisely parallel to that in Micah ii. 9.

Amos v. 26 is one of the most difficult in the book. Our author regards it as an interpolation, because the prophet nowhere else accuses the Israelites of the worship of foreign gods, but reproves simply their corrupt service of Yahweh, and their superstitious reliance on the *opus operatum*. Besides this the intercourse between Israel and Assyria up to this date had been neither of the nature nor of the extent which would explain the adoption of two Assyrian deities as the principal gods of Israel. This, or something approaching this, is clearly implied in the verse we are considering. Wellhausen deletes כּוֹכַב as a gloss on כִּי־יִיִן and צִלְמִיכֶם as a gloss on אֱלֹהֵיכֶם. These are purely conjectural emendations, and the present writer sees no sufficient reason for abandoning a conclusion which he has elsewhere set forth that צִלְ is an integral part of the text, but that צִלְ and אֱל have been accidentally transposed owing to their similarity in form. The remainder of the note errs, if at all, on the side of caution. It refers to the well-known passage in Schrader's *Keilinschriften* (p. 443), but does not fully accept his identification of the סִכּוֹת of our text with *Sak-kuth*. To many cautious students there seems no need of hesitation on this score: the point that does still remain unsettled is the name by which this god was more usually known.

Amos ix. 1 is another *cruce*. Wellhausen renders: "Smite the capital so that the thresholds may shake, . . . and I will, etc." There are two competing interpretations.

The first is that which makes ספיים = architraves. As Marti, in Kautzsch's *Bibelwerk*, puts it, giving *Gesimse* in his text: "Das Wort bedeutet sonst 'Schwellen'; hier wohl die Überschwellen (Architrave)." The first words of our quotation contain a strong argument against the suggestion with which it ends. If the word is nowhere else used with this signification, we shall not be entitled to adopt it here unless the common meaning is quite out of place. The other explanation is that given by Prof. Robertson Smith.¹ He argues that Jachin and Boaz (1 Kings vii.) "were built on the model of those altar-candlesticks which we find represented on Phœnician monuments," and that the altar at Bethel may have been "a pillar crowned by a sort of capital bearing a bowl like those at Jerusalem." Accordingly he renders: "Smite the capital till the bowls ring again, and dash them in pieces on the heads of the worshippers." This would be very attractive if it were well grounded. But if Jachin and Boaz were ever used as altars every trace of this has been effectually removed from the narrative. And the figure in Perrot et Chipiez to which Prof. Smith refers would appear to represent an object too low to be compared with Solomon's pillars and credited with sufficient weight to crush the Israelites to death. On the whole, it is best to adhere to the ordinary view and picture to ourselves the worshippers assembled in front of the temple, when a blow is struck, which makes it quiver from roof to basement, from capital of pillar to threshold, so that it falls in ruins and overwhelms the crowd (cf. Judges xvi. 30). The reasons adduced by Wellhausen for leaving בצעם untranslated are very forcible: a further indication of the uncertainty of the text is the omission of the suffix by the LXX.; the suffix may be a mistaken reduplication of the ב with which the next word opens.

The text of the Book of Micah has suffered so much in

¹ *Religion of the Semites*, pp. 468-470.

transmission that we turn with peculiar interest to its treatment by so competent a critic. How deeply he feels the difficulty of the task is seen by his leaving no fewer than six words or phrases in the first chapter untranslated and five in the second. We have not space for the discussion of these passages, some of which, perhaps, are not so hopelessly corrupt as Wellhausen believes. Three other texts shall be briefly referred to.

For *אתנניה*, Micah i. 7, *אשריה* is suggested. This is, at least, well worthy of consideration. Considering what is said of the fate of the *את* at the end of the verse, it is improbable that they would be represented as burnt at the very outset. And if they are taken to belong to the same class of objects as the *פסילים* and *עצבים*, the *σάματα*, of the Peshiṭta and the *טעתה* of the Targum find a natural explanation.

The problematic *בכו* of Micah i. 10 is represented in the new translation by "in Bekaim," and the note says: "According to Vollers the LXX. probably read *בבכים* for *בכו*. Accho lay quite out of the beat." Yet, notwithstanding the authority of Vollers, it may be doubted whether *Βαχείμ* belongs to the genuine LXX. Had they given *Βαχείμ* at Judges ii. 1, 5, there could have been very little doubt remaining. But in those passages we find *Κλαυθμῶν* and *Κλαυθμῶνες*. And if Accho is out of the question, why is not Gath also? As Cheyne says, "The choice of the town would be dictated by the love of paronomasia," *i.e.*, by a literary, not a geographical consideration. The opinion that *בעכו* was corrupted into *בכו* has not yet been proved unreasonable.

At Micah v. 5, the word *בַּפְתָּחִיהָ* is left untranslated, and in the note the query is proposed, "*בפתחי הרב = בפתחיה?*" To this query it will surely be necessary to return a negative reply. Such a reference by the suffix to the noun *הרב* in the preceding clause would be an ambiguity not very conso-

nant to the genius of the language. What is wanted is a noun parallel to **כרב**, and this is found in the word **פתיחה**, a drawn sword, the plural form of which is used at Psalm lv. 22, and is there understood by all the Versions to mean a weapon. Part of Jerome's note on our passage deserves quoting: "In eo ubi ego et Aquila transtulimus, *in lanceis ejus*. . . . Quinta Editio, *ἐν παραξίφεσιν αὐτῶν*, quod nos possumus dicere, *in sicis eorum*: In Hebræo autem positum est ΒΑΡΗΤΗΕ."

We now turn to a totally different specimen of our author's powers. Many of us have felt that notwithstanding its irresistible impressiveness, there is something jagged and disjointed in the fourth chapter of Zechariah, and that the attempts to explain its symbolism, which presuppose the present arrangement of verses, fail to carry conviction. When Orelli, for example, regards the lamps as symbolizing the fact that the restored community should be God's light-bearer to the world at large the question at once arises whether this was the thought adapted to strengthen the Jews of Zechariah's congregation. When Hitzig and Steiner follow the Massoretic accentuation in v. 10, making the eyes of Yahweh "rejoice and see the plummet, etc.," we cannot but deem this a straining both of language and of sense. Wellhausen's re-arrangement of the verses may be a bold one, but it removes confusion and produces a text which would satisfy the needs it was meant to meet. Justice cannot be done to the attempt without a complete translation:—"And the angel that talked with me came again and waked me, as a man that is wakened out of his sleep. And he said unto me, What seest thou? I said, I see a candlestick all of gold, with a bowl upon it and seven lamps thereon, and seven pipes for the lamps, and two olive trees by it, one upon the right side of the candlestick and the other upon the left side thereof. And I answered and said to the angel that talked with me,

What meaneth this, my lord? And the angel that talked with me answered and said to me, Knowest thou not what this meaneth? I said, No, my lord. And he answered and said to me, These seven lamps are the eyes of Jahveh that go to and fro through the whole earth. And I answered and said to him, What are the two olive trees to the right and left of the candlestick? And he said to me, Knowest thou not what these mean? I said, No, my lord. He said, These are the two anointed ones that stand before the Lord of the whole earth." Then follow 6-10a, as an independent passage, containing the promise that in spite of all hindrances Zerubbabel shall complete the building of the temple.¹ Now it must be freely admitted that several of the details of this translation are open to question. But it is equally plain that the passage as a whole is made more intelligible. The first section, thus arranged, contains a clear and relevant answer to the question proposed in v. 4. The second section gains in force by being detached. The omission of v. 12 as an interpolation is a distinct gain; apart from this verse, any one can form a picture of the lamp-stand and lamps of the vision: keep this verse and the shape becomes unthinkable.

In bringing these necessarily fragmentary remarks to a close it is only fair to add that their fragmentariness does *Die Kleinen Propheten* an injustice. So much else in it deserves examination, and the examination ought to be more exhaustive. But enough has been said to indicate that Wellhausen has given us another most welcome aid to our studies of the Old Testament. Some of the renderings are too free to commend themselves to a conservative taste: there are cases in which they tend to obliterate idiosyncrasies of style. Some of the alterations proposed in the text would

¹ This involves a slight alteration in the rendering of 10a: "For they that have despised the day of small beginnings shall rejoice when they see the key-stone in the hand of Zerubbabel."

be more likely to win acceptance if the reasons for them were stated. But taken altogether this small book of two hundred pages is "full of matter," embodying the best results of the most recent inquiry, and bearing in every line the impress of a fresh and independent mind.

JOHN TAYLOR.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

II. PAUL'S RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

A STUDY of Paul's conception of Christianity may very fitly begin with an enquiry into his religious history, for two reasons. First, because his theology is to an unusual extent the outgrowth of his experience. He is as remote as possible in his whole way of thinking from the scholastic theologian, being eminently subjective, psychological, autobiographical in spirit and method. In this he resembles Luther, and indeed all the chief actors in epochs of fresh religious intuition. Next, because acquaintance with the Apostle's spiritual history helps us to assume a sympathetic appreciative attitude towards a theology which, though utterly non-scholastic in spirit, yet, owing its existence to controversy, deals to a considerable extent in forms of thought and expression belonging to the period, which, to modern readers are apt to wear an aspect of foreignness. How many words occur in Paul's letters bearing apparently a peculiar technical meaning; words the signification of which cannot easily be ascertained, remaining still, after all the theological discussion they have provoked, of doubtful import. Law, righteousness, justification, adoption, flesh, spirit—words these eminently Pauline, and in a high degree original, therefore interesting, as used by him, yet at the same time presenting a somewhat artificial appearance, and withal belonging to the region of theology rather

than to the region of religious intuition. Something is needed to help one to overcome the prejudice thence arising, and it may be found in the intense tragic moral struggle lying behind Paul's theology, and possessing the undying interest of all great spiritual crises. In the case of our Lord, we need no such aid to sympathetic study of His teaching. His mind moved in the region of pure spiritual intuition, and His words therefore possess perennial lucidity and value. They are, indeed, in form as well as in substance, words of eternal life. We have no information as to His inner spiritual history, and we do not feel the want of it, for the lapse of time has no antiquating effect on His profound yet simple utterances.

The autobiographical hints contained in the Epistles which are to form the basis of our study, though comparatively few, are valuable. The passages which exhibit most conspicuously the autobiographical character occur in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians, and in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans. From the former we learn that Paul, before he became a Christian, belonged to the class which in the Gospels appears in constant and irreconcilable antagonism to Jesus. His religion was *Judaism*; in the practice of that religion he was exceptionally strict; he was beyond most of his contemporaries a zealot for the legal traditions of the fathers.¹ In other words, he was a Pharisee, and a virtuoso in Pharisaism. His great aim in life was to be legally righteous, and his ambition was to excel in that line. How much this implies! It means either that this man will never become a Christian, but remain through life the deadly foe of the new faith, or it means that the very intensity of his Pharisaism will cure him of Pharisaism, and make him a Christian of Christians, as he had been before a Pharisee of Pharisees, possessing exceptional insight into

¹ *Galatians* i. 13, 14.

the genius of the new religion, and a wholly unexampled enthusiasm in its propagation.

Which of the two ways is it to be? The autobiographical hints in the seventh chapter of *Romans* enable us partly to foresee. As Paul advanced in Judaism,¹ he made one day a great discovery. He noticed for the first time that one of the commandments in the Decalogue, the tenth, forbade *coveting*,² that is to say, that a mere feeling, a state of the heart not falling under the observation of others, was condemned as sin. This was a revelation to the Pharisaic zealot as instructive for us as it was momentous for him. Two things that revelation shows us. One is how completely the Pharisaic system had deadened the conscience to any moral evil not on the surface. For the average Pharisee there was unrighteousness within in countless forms—evil appetites, desires, passions, yet totally unobserved as states of feeling requiring to be corrected, giving him no trouble or distress, because, forsooth, all was clean and fair without. Jesus often declared this to be the case, and that His judgment was just nothing can more convincingly prove than the fact that for Saul of Tarsus, a disciple of the Rabbis, insight into so commonplace a truth as that coveting is sinful, was an important discovery. The other thought suggested by the great revelation is that Saul, even while a Pharisee, was an extraordinary man. The ordinary man is a complete slave to the moral fashions of his time. He thinks that only evil which passes for evil in his social environment. If it is the fashion to disregard evil within so long as external conduct is in accordance with rule, there is no chance of his discovering that covetousness or any other plague of the heart is morally wrong. He will go serenely on his way, unobservant of the inner world, as a stupid peasant might pass heedless through picturesque scenery. But Saul of Tarsus cannot

¹ *Galatians* i. 14, *προέκοπτον ἐν τῷ Ἰουδαϊσμῷ*.

² *Romans* vii. 8.

permanently do that, for he has moral individuality; therefore, he discovers what others miss. He notes that while one precept says, Thou shalt not *kill*, another forbids what may lead to killing—desire to have what belongs to another. Not all at once, indeed, for the system under which he has been reared has great power over him. But, eventually, insight into the searching character of God's law must come to such a man. For his conscience is not conventional; it has sharp eyes, and can see what to dimmer vision is unobservable, and new moral truth once seen it will not be able to take lightly, merely because for other men the truth it has discovered is of no account.

The momentousness of the discovery for Paul himself it is impossible to exaggerate. It is very easy to underestimate its importance. That to covet is sin, is so axiomatic to the Christian mind that it is very difficult to imagine a state of conscience for which it was a great moral revelation. And familiarity deadens the power to realize the significance of the new truth for one to whom it was a revelation. One can trace the effect of this influence in the recent literature of Paulinism. Interpreters forget that what is commonplace now was once very uncommon, and that truth, when first revealed, produces very different results from those which accompany traditionary belief. In the instance before us the new revelation may be said to have been the beginning of the end. From the day that the eye of Paul's conscience lighted on the words, Thou shalt not covet, his Judaism was doomed. It might last a while, so far as outward habit and even fanatical zeal was concerned, but the heart was taken out of it. That is the import of the other autobiographical hint in *Romans* vii.: "When the commandment came, sin revived and I died."¹ Hope died, because the zealot saw that there was a whole world of sin within, of which he

¹ *Romans* vii. 9.

had not dreamed, with which it was hard to cope, and which made righteousness by conformity with the law appear unattainable. This was a great step onwards towards Christianity. All along the youthful enthusiast, according to his own testimony in after years,¹ had been outrunning his fellow-religionists in pious attainments. His advance hitherto had been within Judaism. But now, without being aware of it, he advances away from Judaism, the outward movement being the natural consequence of the previous rapid movement within. He had been trying to satisfy the innate hunger of his spirit for righteousness with the food that came first to his hand—legal ordinances. It took him some time to discover that what he had been eating was not wheat but chaff. That discovery once made, the imperious appetite of the soul will compel him to go elsewhere in quest of true nourishment. It will not surprise us if he forsake the school of the Rabbis and go to the school of Jesus.

This we know was what eventually happened. Saul of Tarsus became a convert to Christianity. The Pauline letters give no detailed account of the memorable event similar to the narratives contained in the book of *Acts*. But the main feature in the story, as there told, is referred to in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, at the place where the apostle enumerates the different appearances of the risen Christ. "Last of all he was seen of me also."² Modern students of sacred history approach this great turning-point in Paul's life with very diverse bias. Naturalistic theologians desire by all means to resolve the objective appearance into a subjective experience, and to see in the self-manifestation of Jesus to the persecutor not a real Christophany, but a vision due to the convert's excited

¹ *Galatians* i. 14.

² *1 Corinthians* xv. 8. *Vide Acts* ix. 1-9; xxii. 6-11; xxvi. 12-18 for the detailed accounts.

state of mind. Others, dealing with the subject in an apologetic interest, make it their business to vindicate the objectivity of the Christophany, and its independence of subjective conditions.¹ Our present concern is not to refute, and still less to advocate, naturalistic theories of the conversion, but to learn all we can as to the inner history which led up to it, that we may the better understand the event itself and what it involved.

If the comments above made on the autobiographical hint in *Romans* vii. be correct, it follows that the conversion of Paul, however marvellous, was not so sudden and unprepared as it seems. There was that in the previous experience of the convert that pointed towards, though it did not necessarily insure, his becoming a Christian. Nothing is gained by denying or ignoring this fact. And there is more to be included under the head of preparation than has yet been pointed out. While the objective character of Christ's appearance to Paul is by all means to be maintained, it is legitimate to assume that there was a subjective state answering to the objective phenomenon. This may be laid down as a principle in reference to all such supernatural manifestations. Thus the vision and the voices seen and heard by Jesus at His baptism, and at the transfiguration, corresponded to and interpreted His own thoughts at the moment. Applied to the case of Paul, the principle means that before Christ appeared to him on the way to Damascus, He had been revealed in him,² not yet as an object of faith, but as an object of earnest thought. The Christ who appeared to him was not an utterly unknown personality. He had heard of Him before, he knew that His followers believed Him to have risen again from

¹ So Weiss: *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 152; also Stevens, *The Pauline Theology*, p. 15. Dr. Stevens' work is a valuable contribution to the study of Paulinism, though traces of a disciple's reverence towards Dr. Weiss are not wanting. In one very important point, as will appear, he dissents from his master's teaching.

² *Vide Galatians* i. 15.

the dead, and he had had serious reflections as to what such an event implied. As to the precise character of these reflections we have no information, but it is not difficult to make probable conjectures. He who was said to have risen from the dead had been crucified, mainly by the instrumentality of the Pharisaic party to which Paul belonged. By the resurrection, if it occurred, the stigma of crucifixion had been removed, and the claims of the crucified one to be the Christ vindicated. But if Jesus was the Christ, what view was to be taken of His death? Men thought that He had suffered for His own offences. What if He had really suffered for the sins of others, like the servant of Jehovah of whom it was written in ancient prophecy: "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities." And what if the crucified and risen One were a new way of salvation for men who like himself had begun to despair of reaching salvation by the old time-honoured way of legalism.

That such thoughts had passed through Paul's mind is rendered probable by the fact, vouched for by his own confession, that before his conversion he persecuted the disciples of Jesus with passionate zeal.¹ His ardour in this bad work was partly due to the energy of a man who put his soul into everything. But it was due also to what he knew about the object of his fanatical animosity. The new religion interested him very much. It seems to have fascinated him. He hated it, yet he was drawn towards it, and could not let it alone. He was under a spell which compelled him to enquire into its nature, and strive to penetrate into the secret of its growing power. In consequence he understood it as well as was possible for an unfriendly outsider. He evidently regarded it as a rival to Judaism, antagonistic thereto in its whole spirit and tendency, as otherwise it is difficult to comprehend his fiercely hostile attitude towards

¹ *Galatians* i. 13: "Beyond measure I persecuted the church."

it. If he did not get this view of the new religion from Stephen, as the accounts in *Acts* would lead us to infer, it must have come to him from his own keenly penetrating insight. A man like Saul of Tarsus sees below the surface of things, and can detect there what is completely hidden to the ordinary eye. In this respect he may have divined the genius of the new faith better than its own adherents, who for the most part very imperfectly comprehended what was to grow out of the apparently insignificant seed contained in the confession that Jesus was the Christ. He perceived that that confession was by no means insignificant. What! a crucified man the Messiah, shown to be such by resurrection! That, if true, meant shame and confusion to the Pharisees who had put him to death; yea, and something more serious, death to Pharisaism, condemnation of legalism. How, might not be immediately apparent, but the fact must be so. It cannot be that a crucified risen *Christ* should remain an isolated barren portent. It must have been God's purpose from the first, though men knew it not, and it must bear consequences proportioned to its own astounding character.

Only on the assumption that some such thoughts had been working in Saul's mind does his furious *hyperbolic*¹ hostility to Christians become intelligible. These thoughts combined with those ever-deepening doubts as to the attainability of righteousness on the basis of legalism fully account for his mad behaviour. They also prepare us for what is coming.² A man in whose soul such perilous stuff

¹ *Galatians* i. 13, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰδῶκουν.

² The above account of the preparation for the conversion is, not in intention, but in result, a combination to a certain extent of the views of Beyschlag on the one hand and of Pfeiderer on the other. Beyschlag lays the emphasis exclusively on the fruitless struggle after righteousness; Pfeiderer insists with equal oneness on the familiarity with the Christian beliefs about Jesus and the processes of thought these originated in Paul's mind. It seems perfectly feasible to take both into account. For the views of Beyschlag, *vide* his *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (1892), vol. ii. p. 14; for Pfeiderer's, his *Paulinismus: Einleitung*.

is at work cannot be far from a spiritual crisis. By the time the Damascus expedition was undertaken the crisis was due. Is it asked, How could one on the eve of a religious revolution undertake such a task? The answer must be that men of heroic temper and resolute will do not easily abandon cherished ideals, and never are less like surrendering than just before the crisis comes. In the expressive phrase put into Christ's mouth by the historian of the *Acts* they "kick against the pricks."¹

When a spiritual crisis does come to a man of this type, it possesses deep, inexhaustible significance. Such was the fact certainly in the case of Saul. In the view of some writers the spiritual development of this remarkable man took place mainly in the period subsequent to his conversion to the Christian faith. They find in the period antecedent to the conversion little or no struggle, and in the conversion itself they see nothing more than the case of one who, previously an unbeliever in the Messiahship of Jesus, had at length been brought to acknowledge that Jesus was the Christ, through a miraculous demonstration that He was still alive.² It would, however, be nearer the truth to say that on the day Saul of Tarsus was converted his spiritual development to a large extent lay behind him. For him to become a Christian meant everything. It meant becoming a *Paulinist* Christian in the sense which the famous controversial Epistles enable us to put upon that expression. The preparation for the great change had been so thorough that the convert leaped at a bound into a large cosmopolitan idea of Christianity, its nature and destination. The universalism, *e.g.*, which we associate with the name of the Apostle Paul, dates from his conversion. It was not, as

¹ *Acts* xxvi. 14.

² So Dr. Matheson in his very suggestive and ingenious work on *The Spiritual Development of St. Paul*, pp. 39, 65. In his treatment of the subject the alleged development has reference rather to Paul's views of the Christian ethical ideal than to his theological conceptions.

some imagine, a late growth of after years, due to the accident of some persons of Gentile birth showing a readiness to receive the Gospel.¹ Such a view is contrary at once to Paul's own statements,² and to intrinsic probability. The truth is, that a whole group of religious intuitions, the universal destination of Christianity being one of them, flashed simultaneously into Paul's mind, like a constellation of stars on the day of his conversion. As soon as he had recovered from the stunning effect of the strange things that befel him on the way to Damascus, and emerged into clear, tranquil, Christian consciousness, he saw that it was all over with Judaism and its legal righteousness, all over with the law itself as a way to salvation, that salvation must come to man through the grace of God, and that it might come through that channel to all men alike, to Gentiles not less than to Jews, and on equal terms, and that therefore Jewish prerogative was at an end. The eye of his soul was opened to the light of this constellation of spiritual truths almost as soon, I believe, as the eye of his body had recovered its power of vision. For thought is quick at such creative epochs, and feeling is still quicker, and we can faintly imagine with what tremendous force reaction would set in, away from all that belonged to a past now for ever dead; from Pharisaic formalism and pride and pretensions, and from Judaistic narrowness, and from intolerance, fanaticism, and wicked, persecuting tempers, towards all that was opposed to these in religion and morals.

The foregoing view of Paul's conversion, as ushering him at once into a new world of anti-Judaistic thought, is borne out by the autobiographical notices of that eventful period contained in the first chapter of *Galatians*. Four points deserve attention here.

¹ So Weiss, *Introduction*, vol. i. pp. 154, 164; also Stevens, *The Pauline Theology*, p. 21.

² *Galatians* i. 15.

1. The term employed by the Apostle to describe his old way of life invites remark. He calls it *Judaism*.¹ He was not shut up to the use of that term; he might have employed instead, Pharisaism or Rabbinism. He obviously has present controversies in view, and wishes to make his references to past experiences tell against those whose great aim was to get Gentile Christians to Judaize.² It is as if he had said: "I know all about Judaising and Judaism. It was my very life element in long bygone years. There never was such a zealot as I was for national customs on grounds at once of patriotism and of conscience. I was a perfect devotee to the Jewish way of serving God. It is a miracle that I ever escaped from its thrall. It was certainly by no ordinary means that I was set free; not by the method of catechetical instruction, whether through apostles or any others. God alone could deliver me. But He could and He did, effectually and once for all. To His sovereign grace I owe my conversion to Christianity, which meant breaking away completely and for ever from Judaism and all that belonged to it." If this be indeed a true interpretation of what was in the Apostle's mind, we can see with what perfect truth he could protest that he did not get his Christianity from men in general, or from any of the apostles in particular. Which of the apostles could have taught him a Christianity like that, radically and at all points opposed to Judaism?

2. The Apostle virtually asserts the identity of his Gospel throughout the whole period during which he had been a Christian. It is the same Gospel which he received "by revelation"³ at his conversion, which he had preached to the Galatians,⁴ and which he is obliged now to defend against men who call it in question, and seek to frustrate it by every means, as *e.g.* by denying the independent apos-

¹ *Vide* vv. 13 and 14.

² *Galatians* ii. 14: 'Ἰουδαϊστέω.

³ *Galatians* i. 12.

⁴ *Galatians* i. 8.

tolie standing of him who preaches it. It is a gospel which from the first has addressed itself to Gentiles not less than to Jews, and which has treated circumcision and the Jewish law as a whole, as possessing no religious value for Christianity. It may indeed appear as if the assertion that Paul preached such a gospel to the Galatians at the time of his first visit were irreconcilable with what has been stated in our first paper concerning the Apostle's mode of presenting Christian truth to infant churches. But the contrariety is only on the surface. Paulinism was implicitly involved in Paul's mission-Gospel, though the implications were not explicitly stated and commented on. Universalism and denial of the religious significance of the Jewish law were latent in it. Universalism was involved in the simple fact that the preacher addressed himself to a Gentile audience, and the abrogation of the Jewish law was quietly taken for granted by the simple fact that the rite of circumcision was never mentioned. Paul held up a crucified and risen Christ broadly sketched¹ to the eye of faith as the all-sufficient means of salvation, and left it to work its own effect. Unfortunately it soon appeared that his Galatian hearers did not understand the drift of his Gospel as he understood it himself. They saw no inconsistency in beginning with faith in a crucified Jesus and ending with Jewish legalism; but for him these two things then and always appeared utterly incompatible. The position he laid down in his interview with Peter at Antioch: "if by the law righteousness then Christ died in vain,"² had appeared to him self-evident from the time of his conversion onwards. Becoming a believer in Christ meant for him renouncing legal righteousness.

3. The Apostle connects his conversion with his call to be an Apostle to the Gentiles, representing the one as a means to the other as an end. "When it pleased God to

¹ Galatians iii. 1: προέγραφη.

² Galatians ii. 21.

reveal His Son in me that I might preach Him among the Gentiles.”¹ According to Weiss he is simply reading the Divine purpose of his conversion in the light of long subsequent events, which for the first time made him conscious that he was being called in God’s providence to a specifically Gentile mission.² Now it need not be denied that such a procedure would be quite in keeping with Paul’s habits of religious thought, but it may gravely be doubted whether it suited the position in which he was placed when he wrote the Epistle to the Galatians. What the circumstances required was, that he should make it clear beyond all dispute that he was an Apostle, and an Apostle to the Gentiles, by immediate Divine authority and equipment; that both his Gospel and his call came to him direct from the hand of God. In presence of men lying in wait for his halting, and even ready to charge him with falsehood, if they got a chance, could he have so spoken of a call which came to him late in the day, from the fact of Gentiles giving an unexpected welcome to a Gospel which, so far as the preacher’s intention was concerned, had not really been meant for them? If that was how the call came, why should he regard himself as an Apostle to the Gentiles more than any of the eleven apostles, who in like manner saw in events God’s will that Gentiles should be admitted to the fellowship of the Christian faith? Would Paul’s opponents have recognised him as the Gentile Apostle had they known the facts to be as supposed? Would he have dared to state the case as he does in his letter to the Galatians, with solemn protestation that he was not lying,³ had his heathen mission been a tardy afterthought? What could give him the courage to make

¹ *Galatians* i. 15.

² *Vide* his *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. pp. 154, 164. Here also Dr. Stevens follows Weiss, *vide The Pauline Theology*, pp. 21, 22.

³ *Galatians* i. 20.

the statement but a distinct recollection that the change which made him a Christian gave him also the presentiment that the destiny of the converted Pharisee was to be Christ's missionary to the Pagan world? It is scarcely necessary to add that the view advocated by Weiss totally fails to do justice to the strength of Paul's feeling as the Gentile Apostle, to the way in which he habitually magnified his office, to his fervent devotion to the grand programme, Christianity for the world. Such an enthusiasm could not be the product of external circumstances. It must have been the birth of a great religious crisis. Just here lay the difference between Paul and the eleven. Their universalism, if it may be so called, consisted in bowing to God's will revealed in events; his was a profound conviction rooted in a never-to-be-forgotten personal experience. He was born, and born *again*, to be the Gentile Apostle, gifted both by nature and by regeneration for his high calling; and only one of whom this could be said could have undertaken its arduous tasks, and endured its severe trials.

4. Finally, not without bearing on the question at issue, are the particulars mentioned by the Apostle as to his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion. The precise purpose of this visit is probably not fully indicated. The Apostle deems it sufficient to say that he went up to make the acquaintance of Peter, one of the leading apostles.¹ But two points are noteworthy, the careful specification of the date and duration of the visit, and the not less careful exclusion of the other apostles from participation in it.

¹ *Galatians* i. 18, *ιστορήσαι Κηφάν*. The verb is used in connection with going to see important places, great cities, etc. Bengel remarks *grave verbum, ut de re magna*. Paul wishes to suggest that he went to visit the great man of the Christian community; not sneeringly, but possibly not without a slight touch of humour. His opponents laid great stress upon important personalities. He too recognised Peter's importance, but only as an equal, after he had kept three years aloof, and now went to see him as a man who sought neither patronage nor advice.

Paul wishes it to be understood that it was a private friendly visit to Peter alone, in which the other apostles had no concern. To be strictly accurate, he admits that he did see James, the Lord's brother, but he alludes to the fact in such a manner as to suggest that the meeting was accidental and of no significance. There could thus be no question of apostolic authority brought to bear on him on this occasion, as at the conference held in the same city fourteen years later. Then as to the date and duration of the visit: it took place, says the Apostle in effect, three years after my conversion, and it lasted just fifteen days. Very suggestive specifications, and meant to be reflected on in relation to each other. Three years passed before he saw any of the apostles, or had any opportunity of learning from them. And what eventful years in his life, those immediately succeeding his conversion; how much of his spiritual experience he lived through in that time, in the solitude of the Arabian desert! Not till those memorable years of intense meditation are over does he go up to Jerusalem to see Peter; not as a man still at sea and needing counsel, but as one whose mind is clear and whose purpose is fixed. He remains with Peter *fifteen days*. After so long a period he still remembers the exact number of days, for it was a happy time, and one remarkable man does not readily forget the time he has spent in another remarkable man's company. And what passed between them? Much talk on both sides doubtless, Paul relating to Peter his personal history and present views, Peter communicating in turn copious reminiscences of his beloved Master. Paul can have no desire to underestimate the value of these communications, otherwise he would not have stated how long he was with Peter, but would rather have indicated that his stay lasted only for a short while. Very much could be said in a fortnight, and it is quite likely, that in the course of that time, Peter told

Paul all he remembered of Jesus. Yet fifteen days are a short period compared with three years; quite sufficient for a full rehearsal of the Evangelic memorabilia, but hardly enough for a vital process of spiritual development. Paul might learn then the contents of our Gospels, such facts as we read of in the gospel of Mark, but it was not then that he learned, or could possibly learn, his own Gospel. That he had got by heart before he made his visit to Peter.

All this the Apostle means to hint, by his brief rapid jottings relating to this early period. He would say, After my conversion I took no counsel with men in the church who might be supposed able to advise me, in particular I did not put myself in communication with any of the apostles. I retired into the desert for a lengthened period, that there I might be alone with God. At length, when thought and prayer had borne their fruit in an enlightened mind and a firm purpose, and the time for action had come, after three full years,¹ I felt a craving to meet one of the men who had been with Jesus, that one who had ever been the foremost man and spokesman of the twelve, that I might hear him talk of the earthly life of the Lord to whose service I had consecrated my life. I went to see Peter in Jerusalem, desiring from him neither recognition nor counsel, but simply to enjoy friendly intercourse on perfectly equal terms with one for whom I entertained sincere respect. It was a time of delightful fellowship which I can never forget. I remember still the very number of the days, and the topics of our conversation each day. The memory of it is unmarred by any lingering recollections of discord. I opened my heart to Peter and told him all my past experiences and my present thoughts

¹ The expression *μετὰ ἔτη τρία* does not necessarily mean three full years, but the purpose of the Apostle in making the statement justifies the assumption that he is speaking exactly.

and purposes. He showed no sign of dissent, and as for the other apostles, not even, excepting James, whom I did see for a few moments, they had no part in our intercourse. Yet, what I thought and said then, was just what I think and say now.

From the foregoing interpretation of the Apostle's statement regarding his first visit to Jerusalem, it follows that his universalistic antinomian Gospel goes back, if not to the very hour of his conversion, at least to the years immediately following that event and preceding the visit.¹ This period might be included within the conversion, as the time during which the convert attained to a full conception of the significance of the great event.

The view advocated in the foregoing pages does not imply that Paul's system of Christian thought underwent no expansion in any direction after the initial period. We must carefully distinguish here between his religious intuitions and his theological formulations. The former fall within the early years or even days of his Christian career, the latter may have been the slow growth of time; though even they may to a large extent have been worked out during the period of retirement in Arabia. The distinction may be illustrated by a single instance. Among the intuitions may be reckoned the perception that righteousness and salvation are not attainable by legal performances, but only by the grace of God as exhibited in a crucified Christ. This we are to conceive Paul as seeing from the first. But he may have had to go through a lengthened process of reflection before he reached a compact theoretic statement of the truth such as we find in the words: "Him who knew not sin, He made sin on our behalf, that we might become

¹ Such is the view of Holsten: *vide* his *Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 9; also of Beyschlag in his *Neutestamentliche Theologie*: "The main lines of his (Paul's) system" (remarks the latter writer) "as sketched in his interview with Peter at Antioch before any of his Epistles were written, go back, without doubt, to his retirement in Arabia," vol. ii. p. 8.

the righteousness of God in Him." That pithy, pregnant sentence has all the appearance of being the ripe fruit of much thought.

Another distinction has to be taken into account in discussing the question as to the development of Paulinism. We must distinguish between the positive doctrines of the Pauline system and its *apologetic elements*. At certain points, Paul's conception of Christianity appears weak and open to attack, or, to say the least, as standing in need of further explanation. He teaches that righteousness comes not by the law, but by faith in Christ, and that it comes on equal terms to all, without distinction between Jew and Gentile. Three questions are immediately raised by this threefold doctrine. First, if righteousness come not by the law, what end does the law serve? Next, what guarantee is there for ethical interests, for real personal goodness, under the religious programme of righteousness by faith? Lastly, if the benefits of Christ are open to all men on absolutely equal terms, what comes of the Jewish election and prerogative? The answers to these questions constitute the Pauline apologetic. It is probable that the apologetic ideas of his system came to Paul latest of all. First the intuitions, next the positive dogmatic formulæ, lastly, the apologetic buttresses. It need not be supposed that Paul never thought of the defences till some antagonistic critics arose to point out the weak side of his theory. We may be sure that he was his own severest critic, and that answers to the three questions were imperiously demanded by his own reason and conscience. But even on that view the apologetic would naturally come last. In logical order, a theory must be formed before objections can be taken to it. It must first be affirmed that righteousness comes by faith in Christ before the question can be raised, But what about personal righteousness on that hypothesis? Paul's solution of the difficulty is his doctrine of the mystic soli-

parity between the believer and Christ. It was probably one of the latest, as it is certainly one of the most beautiful developments in his system of Christian thinking.

A. B. BRUCE.

CHRIST AT THE POOL OF BETHESDA.

JOHN V. 1.

THIS miracle drew after it the gravest consequences. The dispute which it entailed led Jesus to assert that His working was parallel with that of God; and since His Father, while resting from creation, continued His providential benevolence, He would for His part do the same. It led the hierarchy at Jerusalem to resolve upon His death, as the raising of Lazarus forced them to precipitate it.

It has therefore an immense significance which lies beyond the object of these papers. Their aim is to examine the miracles themselves, the spiritual harmonies which bind them to each other and to the discourses, the mind and character to which they bear witness, and which is identical with what we find in the portion of the narrative that is allowed by all moderate scepticism, and to show how the unbelieving theories neglect or outrage these all-important considerations.

In treating the present miracle there are several preliminary points of interest.

It is well known that the question, at what feast was it performed, affects gravely the chronological arrangement of the ministry of our Lord. If this was a passover, as many have always believed, then we find four passovers during His public work. At one He first cleansed the temple, and a little before another He fed the five thousand (John ii. 13, vi. 4). At another He suffered; and if

this be added to the number, it will involve a minimum duration of three years and a half for His public labours.

On this subject, patristic opinion was divided, largely by considerations entirely outside the passage itself; some desiring to justify by the narrative the half week of Daniel (ix. 26), which is three years and a half, and others to reduce the ministry to a single year, taking too literally Isaiah's "acceptable year of the Lord." But the latter is quite irreconcilable with the mention of three passovers which we have already found in this Gospel.

It was apparently the belief that this feast was a passover which introduced the article into the opening verse—"the feast," instead of "a feast of the Jews."¹ But it is more than doubtful whether a Jew would acknowledge the Passover, and not rather the Feast of Tabernacles, as being pre-eminently "the feast," the supreme feast of all. The early Greek church supposed that Pentecost was intended, and in modern times nearly every festival has had its advocates, many of them upon the slenderest grounds. Perhaps, however, the choice lies between the divinely instituted feast of Passover and that of Purim, which commemorated the deliverance of the Jews from the snares of Haman. On both sides, many inconclusive arguments have been relied upon. Of what avail is it to urge that Jesus would not have attended a feast of merely human institution, when it is certain that He attended the feast of the dedication? On the other side, what weight is in the objection that if this were a passover we have a whole year without any events recorded, when it is admitted that in any case we have a silence of ten months? There would be much weight in the argument that only Purim,

¹ But the absence of the article is not decisive: cf. Matt. xii. 24, Luke ii. 4, Acts viii. 5, and also Deut. xvi. 13, 2 Kings xviii. 15, LXX. Tholuck says that without the article it may be the passover, and with the article it must be so; but this is an overstatement. *Vide* Westcott *in loco*.

which fell in March, lies between the fixed limits of time within which this miracle must be placed (namely, December or January, when Jesus passed through Samaria, and the passover in the sixth chapter), if it did not beg the question at both ends. No person who takes this for a passover will agree that the previous January and the passover in the next chapter belong to the same year. Nor is it at all certain that the phrase "four months and then cometh harvest," gives any clue to the season when it was uttered." Nothing surely could be tamer and less in the manner of Jesus than an expression of surprise because the time of the spiritual harvest did not coincide with that of nature. The point is not that four months must *now* elapse, but that one must always be prepared for such a delay after sowing. Why ask the question "Say not ye," unless to introduce a proverb, meaning "The husbandman waiteth patiently?" In this case it could be used with equal propriety at any season, just as we might say in autumn or midsummer that one swallow does not make a spring.

Perhaps the argument which deserves most weight is that all the other passovers are so distinctly named. It is hard to explain the vague and undefined introduction of this feast, unless its name would have fallen strange upon Gentile ears, and entailed irrelevant explanations. Especially if it were the second in a series of passovers, we cannot see why it should not be named plainly like the rest. And this consideration acquires added force when we remember St. John's carefulness about such matters, so that from his Gospel only we can obtain some approach to a chronological framework into which the history may be fitted.

We may weigh in the other scale Bishop Westcott's comment upon the ninth verse, "on that day was a sabbath." "The form of the phrase is very remarkable," he says, "and suggests the idea that the sabbath was a day of

rest other than the weekly sabbath." This would be much more consistent with the notion of a passover than either Purim or the Feast of Trumpets which he prefers. Edersheim will probably continue to be the only advocate of the Feast of Wood Offering, and on the whole the question remains quite unsettled, with some balance of probability in favour of Purim, and a decided inclination of the scale against the Passover.

It is quite recently that the Palestine Exploration Fund solved another long-disputed question, namely, where is the real pool of Bethesda? The traditional site, known as Birket Israel, did not answer the conditions; and neither did the Pool of the Virgin, further south, to which a preference has been generally given since Robinson suggested it. These conditions were two-fold, those required by scripture, and those which came, with some authority, from the early Christian writers. The former taught us that it should have five porches, and should lie on the east side of the city, which because it was nearest to the pastures would certainly contain the sheep gate.¹ The latter told us that it was a double pool, and that a Christian church had been erected over it. But very lately some Turkish houses close to Birket Israel were demolished, and the ruins of a Christian apsidal church were discovered below. Under this church was found a crypt, consisting of two tiers of porches, five porches in each tier; and these covered a double cistern hewn out of the solid rock, and answering exactly to the description in Eusebius of "twin pools." The church was of course a later erection which had utilized the old porches as a crypt, itself commemorating what had happened there. And not only is every condition of the problem thus satisfied, but the conviction of the early church is very plainly expressed, for in the crypt, among several frescos of the usual type, is found the

¹ This gate is mentioned three times by Nehemiah (iii. 1, 32, xii. 39).

genius of the spot, the angel in the act of troubling the waters.

The expression "there is in Jerusalem a pool" claims a little attention for the emphatic verb. It scarcely proves that the city was standing when the present tense was used; but if not, it expresses the clear vision of one who recalls a scene which he has looked upon. Who that had not been familiar with Paris before the war could possibly now write, There is beside the Rue Rivoli the Tuileries? How much less, if both had been demolished.

The feast of Purim appears to have had little of sacredness in its observance, which was wild and boisterous. But this does not justify the inference that Jesus would have felt no patriotic interest in the celebration of a great national deliverance. It was neither His policy nor His habit, like that of some who follow Him, to reject what is inherently good because it was ill-treated by unworthy hands. And the Church, being the leaven and the salt of the world, must always carefully consider what things are hopelessly soiled and tainted by their associations, and what others retain, even in their degradation, a core of good worth vindicating.

But if it was indeed this too riotous feast which He attended, how suggestive is the place in which we find Him, a home of sorrow, itself most probably named (though none of the derivations offered is entirely satisfactory) from the emotions which it evoked, the House of Pity.

Jesus knew how much more blessed it is to go to the place of mourning than of feasting; and at a feast-time, when selfishness most easily forgets the wretched, He came where lay a multitude of sick, blind, halt and withered,—the first of which epithets must not be divided into the other three, but taken as an additional statement.

They were attracted thither by a curious superstition, very easy to account for. When a medicinal spring is

intermittent in its flow, the water is most efficacious while freshly welling up. Such a spring was here, and its effects were not only most real at the moment when the spring was troubled, but were greatly heightened by credulity and hope, for since it availed for some and not for others, and chiefly during the mysterious movement in its depths, a belief grew up that it was an angel who thus stirred it, and the first who then entered the waters received a miraculous cure "of whatsoever disease he had." How wild was the rush that ensued we know by the complaint of the impotent man that he had no man to throw him in [*ἵνα...βάλη με*, which however the R.V. renders "put"]; and in such a struggle the cases which received no benefit would never be supposed to have entered the water first. Such was the popular belief, and as it is implied in the speech in v. 7, an explanatory comment quickly found its way into the text.

But the weight of evidence against its authenticity is so preponderant that the contention of some sceptics like Strauss and Reuss for its genuineness is not very creditable to their candour. It simply betrays their determination to assume, even against the evidence, whatever hypothesis is most damaging to their opponents.

To the sufferers who thus lay beside the pool, enslaved by disease while a national deliverance was celebrated, tortured and miserable while the streets resounded with festivity, came Jesus with His merciful heart on fire.

As He read the lamentable story of the woman of Samaria, as He knew from the first who should betray Him, so He at once discerned the most unhappy creature in all this concourse of the forlorn. This man had suffered infirmity for eight and thirty years, and now that either the resources of medicine had failed, or, like the woman who touched Jesus, he had reduced himself to poverty in pursuit of them, he lingered here, and even here was without hope. Others could hire some one to hurry them at

the good moment into the pool, while he crawled feebly toward the water's edge, mocked by the sight of what he supposed was health for him, and tantalized by the exultation of his rivals.

A long train of such experiences ends in a benumbed and torpid mood, which is perhaps of all tempers the most alien to spiritual influences. When hope has died down into a vague wish, and even desire is scarcely more than a dull recollection of better things, it is hard then to quicken expectation into life again. Yet, whenever in the nature of things it was possible, Jesus required some co-operation from those whom He would bless. He could not do many mighty works because of unbelief. He said, What wilt thou that I should do for thee? and again, Believest thou that I am able to do this? It was doubtless to develop expectation by demanding action that He often sent men to a distance. And we shall find Him conveying to the deaf and dumb, by a most vivid sign, some expectation of the help He would bestow. The importance of faith is taught by Him in acts as well as in words.

Peter and John had learned this lesson, when, in order to work their earliest miracle after His ascension, they caused the impotent man to fasten his eyes upon them.

It was therefore in profound harmony with the inner principles on which He acted, that Jesus began by stirring a more vivid emotion in the half-frozen heart of this poor sufferer by asking whether he had any real and active desire to be made whole (*θέλεις*, not *βούλει*). The question and the divine bearing of the questioner availed at least to establish sympathetic relations between the two so strangely contrasted, and the man poured out a long despondent verbose statement of his miseries. With what a voice and look Jesus bade him arise and walk we may judge by the electrical effect, as hope rose at once to belief, and belief made the effort and succeeded. He took up his

bed and went on walking. The imperfect tense *περιεπάτει* reminds one of the energetic exercise of his new powers by the lame man at the Beautiful Gate, walking and leaping and yet holding the apostles all the while—not running, therefore.

Some one has written, "There was nothing urgent in the malady: the miracle was therefore wrought, not *although* it was the sabbath, but *because* it was the sabbath." But this entirely ignores the most potent impulse in the deed, the compassion in the breast of Him who argued, in a similar case, that since one would not expose an ass or an ox to a day of suffering, a daughter of Abraham *ought* to be loosed from her bond upon the sabbath day. It was the nobility of heart in that reply which made all the people glorify God. And the same motive was sufficiently "urgent" here.

But why did Jesus order him to carry off his humble bed, his "pallet"? Because he was a poor man and should not lose it, and because Jesus habitually attended to small economies, bidding His disciples gather up the broken and undistributed pieces of bread in order that nothing should be lost. Here then, as in so many places, we discover deep harmonies between actions in themselves unlike.

When the Pharisees called the man to account, he supposed himself to have a conclusive defence; his benefactor, "He that made me whole," had so directed it. And the answer of the Pharisees is quite dramatic in its evasive surliness. They pass over altogether the question of the miracle (which deserved some attention, one would have supposed), and in asking who gave the presumptuous order, they place the strongest emphasis on the expression, "What *man* is he?"—a mere man contradicting a divine precept!

Jesus, upon working the miracle, had promptly conveyed

Himself away; and it was natural that this impotent creature could not identify Him, having had no chance to gaze upon celebrities. But why had the Master so very abruptly withdrawn Himself?

It is scarcely enough to say that He shrank from merely curious observation, especially when the connection is remarked which St. John makes between the multitude in that place and the rare word, ἐξένευσεν, conveyed Himself away, which is found nowhere else in the New Testament. Archbishop Trench rather oddly explains the word by that side-long movement which slips most easily through a crowd, and quotes Beza, connecting the word with *νέω*, and thinking of a swimmer gliding through the waves. But Bishop Westcott rightly explains it as literally meaning "to bend the head aside to avoid a blow," which is entirely consistent with its use in the Septuagint. Now when we consider what kind was the "multitude in that place,"—the unhappy crowd that was described a few verses earlier—remembering also that it was no part of the design of Jesus to anticipate the restoration of all things by working wholesale and indiscriminate healings, we understand well what "blow" He thus avoided, even the importunities of the miserable, falling heavy upon His heart. But why should not myth or legend have sent all these sufferers away rejoicing?

Again therefore we find a deep fitness underlying actions and even words which have caused misunderstanding or perplexity.

There is a marked and appropriate difference between our Lord's spiritual treatment of this man and the paralytic who reached Him through the roof. The faith of the latter was as keen and eager as the heart of the other was apathetic. Therefore Jesus, who connected the disease of both with sin, if not with special sin, said frankly to one Thy sins are forgiven thee, and to the other spoke in solemn and earnest warning: Sin no more, lest a worse thing come upon

thee. It is clear that He was far from being satisfied with this man's condition; but it does not follow that a mean desire to ingratiate himself with the priests led him to betray Jesus by reporting His identity. This notion was perhaps suggested by that misunderstanding of the Lord's abrupt disappearance from Bethesda which has just been dealt with. But it is quite inconsistent with the man's persistence in using the unwelcome instead of the malicious phrase; not, It was Jesus who had bidden him to carry his bed, but it was Jesus who had made him whole.

We are now in a position to appreciate aright the attack of Keim upon this narrative. For him it is a mere variant upon that of the paralytic at Capernaum. "The illness, the culpability, the helplessness, the call of Jesus, the controversy with the Pharisees on the subject of blasphemy, as well as the period—in the early part of Jesus' ministry—are the same" (iii. 216). The illness and the helplessness are the same thing reckoned twice, and too common to prove anything, as also is the period. The controversies are as different as possible, both as to the accusation, the reply, and the pivots of thought round which they turn. In one case it is not certain that there was any special culpability at all, and the treatment of the two sufferers in respect of sin is not only quite different but most suitably so, and in a manner which admirably displays the same person, dealing on the same principles with cases which widely diverge.

Keim admits that "of the faith which achieves its object in spite of all hindrances, nothing remains but the vexation of one who is deprived of his bath by swifter feet." A marvellously small residuum of faith is vexation, and this is an admission that the very inspiration and motive of the two works is different. He claims to identify "the call of Jesus" in both cases, as if in one Jesus was not turned aside from His discourse by the admirable urgency of a believer, while in the other He Himself arouses an utterly torpid sufferer,

impotent in the heart as in the limbs. The calls are precisely the reverse of one another. The fault of such exposition, which is radical, lies in fixing the attention upon petty and external points, and failing to recognise the grand and spiritual resemblances and variations which at once identify the agent and distinguish the acts.

When we have grasped these realities we need only smile at freaks like those of Strauss, for whom the story is a parable, the sufferer is the Jewish nation, the thirty-eight years are those of his penal wandering in the wilderness, and the five porches in which he vainly sought for health are the pentateuch.

The resemblances relied upon by scepticism and by the church are as different as a frosted window-pane and a forest of palms: in the one all is external, superficial, unreal, and evanescent; the other has roots and organic cohesion and the flow of sap. The miracle according to Strauss has crystallized in the frost of a German study; the other is worthy of an apostle, and has helped to convert mankind.

G. A. CHADWICK.

SURVEY OF LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT.

INTRODUCTION.—For the most instructive work in this department during the last few months, one must look to the pages of this Magazine, in which the researches of Professors Sanday, Ramsay, and Smith have appeared. For an account of the newly published fragments of the Book of Enoch, and of the Gospel and Apocalypse of St. Peter, the enquirer will also turn to this Magazine. And it may suffice to say in addition that Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have published in a handy form *A Popular Account of the Newly Recovered Gospel of St. Peter* from the competent hand of Prof. Rendel Harris. In this convenient shape may be read an English translation of the recovered portion of the Gospel, together with such an account of its origin and use in the primitive Church, and

of its recent discovery, as a reader requires. Prof. Harris gives precisely the amount of information which the public will seek regarding this interesting "find."

The Trustees of the Lightfoot Fund, in the discharge of their literary executorship, have issued in a collected form five of the Dissertations which added so materially to the value of Bishop Lightfoot's Commentaries. These are published by Messrs. Macmillan & Co., under the title, *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age*. The essays chosen for republication are those on The Brethren of the Lord, St. Paul and the Three, The Christian Ministry, St. Paul and Seneca, and The Essenes. These, it need not be said, are all of great and permanent value. They are republished without alteration or addition, save that to the Essay on the Christian Ministry two short appendices are added, in the one of which his final opinion on the genuineness of the seven Greek Ignatian Epistles is given, while in the other there is printed a collection of extracts which he himself made in order more clearly to illustrate his view of the origin and growth of the Episcopate. By the kindness of Prof. J. E. B. Mayor the references to the works of Seneca, in the essay bearing upon his relation to Paul, are made more exact and available. It is a great convenience to have these Dissertations in this convenient and handsome form.

A large amount of excellent material will be found in *Book by Book* (Messrs. Isbister & Co.). In this full and compact volume are reprinted from Messrs. Virtue & Co.'s *New Illustrated Bible* the introductions to the various books. These introductions were supplied by such scholars as Prof. A. B. Davidson, Prof. Sanday, the late Prof. Elmslie, Archdeacon Farrar, and Dr. Salmon; and although written in a popular form many of these introductions are of quite exceptional merit. Prof. Sanday's account of the Gospels may be instanced as a triumph of skill in popularizing scientific knowledge. There does not exist a more thoroughly satisfactory account of the origin and relation of the Synoptic Gospels.

Another reprint is, it is to be feared, born out of due season. This is the late Prof. Birks' *Horæ Evangelicæ*, now edited by Rev. H. A. Birks and published by Messrs. George Bell & Sons. Prof. Birks was a man of very wide reading and of great mental vigour, whose work has scarcely been duly appreciated, perhaps chiefly because of his conservatism and advocacy of failing causes. It is

pathetic to read this volume and see so enormous an amount of painstaking study and sometimes brilliant suggestion thrown away in the vain attempt to buttress a doomed position. That position is that our four Gospels were written in the order in which they now stand in our Bibles, and that they were successively dependent. The present conclusions of criticism are not indeed certain, but they so command the attention of workers in this field that Prof. Birks' theory will scarcely get a patient hearing. His arguments ought, however, to be taken into account. And every reader of the volume will endorse the words of his son in his modest and manly and pious preface: "I do feel confident that those who will take the pains to study these early labours of my father's ripe manhood carefully, whether or no they can assent to all his arguments, will find some mists removed and some fresh light upon a subject that ever must remain of deepest interest."

From America (Fleming H. Revell Company) we have received *An Introduction to the Study of the Books of the New Testament*, by the Rev. John H. Kerr, A.M. This is an unpretentious but thorough piece of work. It is not intended for scholars but for popular use, and for this purpose nothing could well be better. It covers the whole ground, it is well proportioned, and although conservative it is fair and reasonable. It is written in a pleasant style and is very prettily printed. It should find a large circulation in this country.

A second edition has appeared of Mr. F. P. Badham's *Formation of the Gospels* (Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co.), a fact which speaks volumes for the interest taken in the Synoptic Problem. For Mr. Badham's essay is not at all in the line of current criticism but follows a path of its own, and that by no means an easy one to follow. The theses he supports are two: (1) "That our canonical St. Mark cannot in whole or in part be identified with the document described by John the elder, but that there is a document, peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Luke, and alien to the remainder of both, which answers to John the elder's description"; and (2) "That the lowest stratum of the triple tradition is generally to be found in our first canonical Gospel, occasionally in our second, and that this lowest stratum consists of *twin* Gospels." If these theses be proved then our second Gospel is not St. Mark's reminiscences of the preaching of St. Peter, but is an attempted harmony of two Gospels which were in the hands of disciples of

St. Matthew. St. Mark did write down what he could recall of the preaching of St. Peter, but this is not to be found in the second but in the third Gospel, in which it is combined with our second canonical Gospel. In the support of these positions a thorough and independent examination of the Gospels is made, and many interesting facts are brought out; but Mr. Badham's idea runs so counter to recent criticism, and at least *apparently* to tradition, that perhaps he may find it difficult to gain a patient hearing.

Two works of importance in apologetic literature, which have recently appeared, deal so largely with questions of New Testament criticism that attention must here be called to them. These are Dr. Bruce's contribution to Messrs. Clark's International Theological Library, and Dr. Fisher's *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*. They differ widely, the former being the more original and powerful, the latter the more comprehensive. Dr. Bruce by his previous writings has won for himself the foremost place among living apologists, and although he has never concentrated his ideas in one well-wrought whole, as Butler did in his *Analogy*, it might fairly be questioned whether he has not served his generation as well as the immortal Bishop of Durham. He has the gifts, experience, and training, which go to the making of a perfect defender of the faith. One feels that he is intellectually on a level with the ablest assailants of our religion and has a sanity and balance which they sometimes want. He has read widely, and understands the philosophical presuppositions of Christianity; he has also that aptitude for philosophical discussion without which no man in our day can be a successful apologist. He never underestimates the importance nor misconceives the significance of an assault upon Christianity. He has sufficient sympathy with doubt to enable him to enter into the doubter's point of view; and although on rare occasions he indulges in a kind of grim banter, he is always respectful to earnest thought and treats with seriousness the serious antagonist. Too much interested in the subject of debate to condescend to personalities, he at all times penetrates to the very heart of the difficulty, and treats it radically. No apologetic writing of our time presents so few superficial or partial criticisms, or deals so persistently with the fundamentals of the argument. Like Samson he always lays hold of the two main pillars.

The present volume at once gains and suffers by the fact that

it is not the first apologetic work Dr. Bruce has undertaken. It gains in maturity, in ease and force, in all that results from familiarity with the ground. It suffers, because, apparently from the author's reluctance to repeat himself, he does not give us a full treatment of points he has treated elsewhere, and when he does go over ground he has previously covered, his abundant references to his own books show us we are not getting many fresh ideas. This applies especially to his treatment of the important subjects of revelation and miracles. These had been so thoroughly handled in his *Miraculous Element in the Gospels*, and his *Chief End of Revelation*, that advance was scarcely to be expected. It is possible, therefore, that those who make Dr. Bruce's acquaintance for the first time, through the present volume, may be disappointed that certain subjects, which they might expect to be treated in a volume entitled *Apologetics*, are either omitted altogether or receive slender notice. But, accepting Dr. Bruce's idea of apologetics, and taking into account that this is not his only work in this department, the reader will unquestionably find himself gaining a clearer view of what Christianity really is, and a firmer hold of its reasonableness and truth.

Dr. Bruce is nowhere more successful than in his exposition of the origins of Christianity. He is nowhere so much at home as in dealing with the Gospels and the history they embody. And there does not exist in our language so satisfactory or original a treatment of the historicity of the Gospels, the claims of Jesus, and the significance of His appearance; nor have we so just and informing a criticism of the theories of primitive Christianity. The entire third part of the book will be accepted as a most substantial contribution to New Testament criticism. It effectually disposes of objections which have annoyed if they have not alarmed the faithful, and it lifts the religion of the New Testament, and even its documents, into a region in which many of the usual objections are at once seen to be irrelevant. The Church at large will inevitably recognise Dr. Bruce's *Apologetics* as a volume of great and permanent value. [In a second edition, which will soon be called for, the views of Holtzmann on the Gospel of Mark might be brought up to date; many misprints of proper names and titles of books must be purged out; and on p. 473 for "fifth decade" read "sixth decade."]

Dr. George P. Fisher, of Yale, published in 1883 a volume

which he named *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief*. This is now re-issued by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, and will be found an excellent manual of apologetics. Dr. Fisher is a sober and forcible thinker who has thoroughly informed himself on all matters connected with his subject. He sets himself courageously to the task of defending the entire circumference of the bulwarks of the Christian faith, and is equally at home in expounding the argument for the being and personality of God as in refuting Baur's theory of the primitive Church. The whole work is competently done, and it is satisfactory to have a book which adequately covers the entire field. Dr. Fisher's strength as an Apologist has been manifested in his essays on the Supernatural Origin of Christianity and in other volumes; the present work shows the ripe fruit of prolonged acquaintance with the subject.

A very able and important book has been issued by Mr. Robert F. Horton on *Revelation and the Bible* (T. Fisher Unwin). Believing that the Bible contains a substantially accurate record of the progressive revelation of God, and accepting the main conclusions of criticism regarding the human origin of its various parts, he aims at proving that faith has nothing to fear from criticism. Manifestly it is a delicate business to disentangle the human element from the Divine; but by bringing into prominence and stating with clearness and force the various stages of revelation Mr. Horton gives the reader so firm a hold of what is positive that reassurance must necessarily result from a perusal of his volume. Mr. Horton's method is simple: he takes up each portion of Scripture and indicates the revelation it contains, and while conducting this process he takes occasion to illustrate the true bearing of inspiration upon the efficiency of the record. No book contains so many just thoughts regarding the Bible, or is likely to be so helpful at the present time. It is of the utmost importance that it should be widely read.

Another excellent book on the Bible is Mr. J. Paterson Smyth's *How God Inspired the Bible, Thoughts for the Present Disquiet* (Samuel Bagster & Sons). The volumes on cognate subjects already published by Mr. Smyth have found a wide circulation; but the present is an abler performance than his previous essays. Indeed it is of marked ability. It is written with excellent taste and judgment, and in a conciliatory spirit; but it is perfectly outspoken, and there is no possibility of mistaking the Author's

meaning and opinions. The object of the essay is to show that the fact of inspiration is safe from assault, as it is that vital breath which has given life and power to the Bible all through the ages; that the effects of inspiration must be ascertained by an examination of the actual Bible which inspiration has produced; that some popular notions of inspiration do not tally with the facts presented by the Bible and must therefore be discarded; that inspiration does not carry with it inerrancy in details; and that the fundamentals of the Christian faith are not dependent on inspiration. The only point at which some readers will be disposed to question the accuracy of his reasoning is where he differentiates between the inspiration of the Biblical writers and ordinary Christians. But as a whole the book is excellent, and cannot fail to carry conviction to all open minds. It is a clear, full, reasonable, persuasive statement of a most thorny subject.

EXPOSITION.—The Expositor's Bible moves on towards completion. To the New Testament two volumes have recently been added, Prof. Findlay on the *Ephesians*, and Prof. Stokes' second volume on the *Acts of the Apostles*. Prof. Findlay was so very successful in dealing with the Epistle to the Galatians in this Series that his readers would have been more than satisfied had he merely maintained the high standard he there set for himself. But in the present exposition he occasionally rises to greater heights; and if the former volume must still bear the palm for energy, spontaneity, and force, the present exposition surpasses it in variety and loftiness of thought. Some of the volumes of this series have adhered very closely to the text, and have sought to serve for English readers the same purpose as commentaries on the original serve for those who know Greek: others have laid themselves out rather to indicate the legitimate application and expansion of the meaning of Scripture. Prof. Findlay does both. Every page shows that he has made a minute and careful examination of the text, while in every chapter there are inferences drawn and suggestions thrown out which will find their way into many sermons. They who know this Epistle best will be the first to acknowledge the value of Prof. Findlay's exposition.

In the second volume of Dr. Stokes' exposition of the *Acts of the Apostles*, there is no flagging of that industry and intelligence which were perceptible in the first. All sources of information have been ransacked, transactions of learned societies, records of

travel, works in historical geography like Prof. Ramsay's. Some expositors might have been content to use the stores already accumulated by the well-known biographers of Paul, but Dr. Stokes has found some not insignificant gleanings. Although the subject is so hackneyed, this last exposition is fresh and interesting, and while the lay reader will peruse it with pleasure and profit, the student will not feel that he has exhausted the possible sources of information until he has consulted Dr. Stokes.

Very nearly thirty years have elapsed since the Rev. Thomas Dehany Bernard, now Canon of Wells, delighted the theological world with his Bampton Lectures. Since that time one has often wondered why so original and ingenious a teacher remained silent. Canon Bernard has at last broken silence by publishing with Messrs. Macmillan & Co. a study and exposition of five chapters of St. John's gospel, chapters xiii. to xvii., which he somewhat ambiguously names *The Central Teaching of Jesus Christ*. He finds the teaching contained in these chapters to be central both because it intervenes between Christ's manifestation to the world and His passion, and also because it closes His teaching in the flesh and foreshadows His teaching in the Spirit. To all intents and purposes Canon Bernard's volume is a commentary on these chapters. There is a close and constant reference to the Greek text, although the reader is not disturbed by minute or useless grammatical remarks. It is that kind of commentary which cannot be written to order: it bears on its face the plain marks of having been written as a labour of love and of being the result of many years of fond brooding on the words of Christ. Passages of great beauty occur from time to time, and significant points are discovered where too often they have been passed by. More continuous in its exposition of the substance of these chapters than an ordinary commentary, it conveys the impression more compactly and effectively. Among all the volumes which have recently appeared on the gospel of St. John, this work of Canon Bernard's has the distinctive excellence of at once ascertaining with accuracy the meaning of the text and opening up its spiritual significance.

Prof. J. B. Mayor's elaborate commentary on *The Epistle of St. James, The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Comments* (Macmillan & Co.), has come in too late for careful examination, but dipping in here and there one sees how vast is the labour which has been spent upon it, and how completely it furnishes

us with everything that can be conceived as helpful to the understanding of the Epistle. The Introduction is complete without being prolix, the critical apparatus is elaborate, the notes full and rich, the chapters on the style and grammar very informative, and the whole is evidently the production of a scholar who has found pleasure in his work and has been in no hurry to publish. It will probably be found worthy of a place alongside of Ellicott, Lightfoot, and Westcott. The exegetical notes are certainly most helpful, as rich in parallels as Wetstein and always clear and helpful. In some instances, possibly, the point may be missed, as in ii. 26; in some the point may not be brought out with sufficient clearness, as in i. 23; the reconciliation of James and Paul might have been more effectively exhibited, and in the chapter on those to whom the Epistle is addressed, Prof. Mayor has lost something by not consulting Beyschlag's *New Testament Theology*. But, notwithstanding, this volume will long remain the Commentary on James, a storehouse to which all subsequent students of the Epistle must be indebted.

Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton continue the publication of Dr. Maclaren's Notes on the International Sunday School Lessons, and we now have *The Gospel of St. Luke*. The notes are of the same character as those on the first Gospel. As a commentary for preachers nothing could be better. Dr. Maclaren evidently makes a close study of the passage, but his exposition is never a mere echo of what may be found in any of the standard commentaries. There is always an imaginative reproduction of the scene, a delicate perception of the salient features, and a strong and explicit didactic inference which are peculiarly his own.

SERMONS.—The quality of the sermon literature of the past months may best be estimated by consulting Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton's *Sermon Year Book for 1892*. This volume, whose *format* is irreproachable, contains sixteen fully reported sermons, fifty outlines, a large number of subjects for sermons with their associated texts (helpful and suggestive), together with a collection of the most notable illustrations and anecdotes which have been used by preachers throughout the year. Wisely used, this volume should improve the sermons of 1893.—Going somewhat further back than last year, we have several reprints. Among these appears, from Messrs. Macmillan & Co., still another edition of Maurice's finest and most characteristic volume, *The Prophets*

and Kings of the Old Testament. These discourses gave a great impulse to the study of the Old Testament, and will survive all critical amendments of our conception of O. T. history, being based on knowledge of human nature and the permanent principles of God's dealing with man.—The same firm has completed its re-issue of the *Lincoln's Inn Sermons*, and has added a volume entitled *Christmas Day and other Sermons*. Many of the discourses which appear in this volume were delivered at Guy's Hospital. Messrs. Macmillan also reprint the fifth edition of Maurice's *Theological Essays*. It is interesting to observe how much of the "perilous stuff" at which the orthodox public of 1853 shuddered has now been absorbed into our popular theology. There is however still a residuum of unassimilated material; and whether this can now be utilized or must finally be rejected, the volume will be found stimulating.—Archdeacon Farrar's *Mercy and Judgment* has also been reprinted by Messrs. Macmillan, and even those who cannot agree with his conclusions will be glad to have so powerful a statement of opinions which are certainly very largely held within all Christian Churches.—Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have also issued several volumes of sermons. A second volume of the late Prof. Elmslie's remains, entitled *Expository Lectures and Sermons*, will be welcomed by all who knew the preacher. They are edited by Mr. A. N. Macnicoll, who has evidently done his work with intelligence and care. Does it need yet to be said that in Prof. Elmslie, England lost her brightest, most intelligent and most sympathetic preacher?—A memorial volume of the late Dr. Cairns' sermons has been edited by his brothers, and is issued by the same firm under the title of the first discourse included, *Christ the Morning Star*. The characteristic of these sermons is massive eloquence. There is no seeking for new subjects or straining after novelty of any kind, but the old gospel themes are treated by a singularly masculine mind and powerful imagination. The irresistible moral force of the preacher freshens the most hackneyed themes. For sanity of thinking and native eloquence these sermons will not easily be surpassed.—Dr. Stalker, of Glasgow, calls the volume which he publishes with Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton *The Four Men and other Chapters*, but he will not resent our classing his chapters with sermons. Dr. Stalker is a preacher both born and made. Few men have so many of the gifts which preaching requires, and no man better

understands the art of preaching or has more carefully cultivated it. In the present well-produced volume he has collected eight characteristic specimens of his art. He has been induced to do so by the circumstance that three of them have already found a circulation in America, and he reasonably concludes that what is good for America cannot be bad for Britain. The subjects are such as attract young men; and it need scarcely be said that they are treated in a lively, lucid, and vigorous manner. To preachers may be commended Dr. Stalker's method of dividing his subject.—By the same firm is now issued a series of lectures which Dr. Adolph Saphir left ready for the press, *The Divine Unity of Scripture*. Those who hold the extreme traditional, falsely called conservative, view of Scripture will in this volume find their own opinions expressed with eloquence and force; but enquiring minds will find no assistance.—Very heartily to be recommended are three volumes of addresses on Christian conduct. The first, by Dr. Sandford, Bishop of Gibraltar (Macmillan & Co.), appears as *Words of Counsel to English Churchmen Abroad*. Had the Author's modesty permitted, he might have justly called his book, *Wise Words of Counsel*. For these eminently practical and straightforward addresses are always judicious, and sometimes rise to the height of wisdom. That on the sin of gambling is a model of the manner in which such subjects should be treated.—Mr. R. F. Horton proclaims the nature of his volume by its title, *This Do: Six Essays in Practice* (Messrs. James Clarke & Co.). These Essays treat of the Christian in Business, in Public Life, in the Home, in Amusement, and so forth. No one will be disappointed with these Essays. They are very thorough discussions of the important subjects they handle: and few subjects at present need to be more firmly dealt with than Amusement, Art, Literature, Public Life, and Business in their relation to Christianity. Mr. Horton's book is small, but it should do a world of good.—Another series of similar discourses is issued by Archdeacon Sinclair (Elliot Stock), and is named *The Servant of Christ*. These discourses are founded on addresses to the people, and cover a pretty wide field. They are easy and fluent, and they are copiously illustrated with quotation and anecdote.

MISCELLANEOUS.—As the crown of his notable series of commentaries on the Pauline Epistles, Prof. J. Agar Beet now issues the first of four volumes in which he means to publish a systematic

theology. This volume is called *Through Christ to God*—not a happy title for a book of the kind, although the reader gradually perceives why it was chosen. The series is intended to give “an exposition of all that is known by man touching the unseen basis of religion, thus covering the whole chief matter of Systematic Theology. This work belongs equally to Christian Evidences. For step by step these statements are supported by what claims to be conclusive argument. In other words, I endeavour to prove that the orderly statements here given represent objective reality.” I am not sure that this mingling of apologetics with systematic is advantageous. Sometimes it is bewildering. This volume deals with the fundamentals of the Gospel, Justification through Faith, the Death of Christ, the Person of Christ, and His Resurrection. The second volume will give an account of the New Life in Christ, the third will treat of the Church of Christ, and the fourth of The Last Things. Probably the chief desideratum in this course will be felt by students to be a fuller treatment of the doctrine of God. But it is a great matter to have theology approached from fresh points of view and treated by new methods. Prof. Beet, too, is a man who has earned the right to be listened to. His mind is clear, logical, orderly, and architectural. He can plan a large whole, and keep details in suitable proportion. He has spent his life in the preparatory discipline of a minute study of the New Testament, and the fruit of this discipline, of honest and independent investigation, is everywhere apparent in this volume. Even where one may not agree with his conclusions, Prof. Beet’s accumulation and arrangement of material, as well as his indication of the real points at issue, cannot fail to be helpful. In explaining the rationale of the atonement he adduces much that is essential and suggestive; but his argument to prove that God cannot pardon the guilty by royal prerogative and without punishment fails by neglecting to consider the ordinary difficulty, why cannot God pardon the truly penitent? In discussing faith, too, while much that is enlightening is brought forward and well arranged, we cannot but think that his definition excludes what Paul considered to be the very soul of faith. The faith that justifies he defines as “an assurance, resting on the word and promise of God, that God now receives into His favour as heirs of eternal life us who believe the good news of salvation announced by Christ.” He says indeed that there is a profounder faith which

is to be treated in the next volume, but it seems precarious to hold that the faith which justifies is not the faith which unites to Christ. We prefer the definition given in the Westminster Shorter Catechism. As a whole, however, Dr. Beet's book is a most scholarly, intelligent, and acceptable addition to the literature of Biblical and Systematic Theology.

Mr. Frank Ballard has collected a series of addresses which he delivered at Norfolk Road Wesleyan Chapel, Brighton, and has published them, through Messrs. James Clarke & Co., under the title, *Reasonable Orthodoxy*. These addresses are vigorous and enlightened presentations of Christian truth as presently held by the reasonably orthodox, and they are likely to be of service in diffusing just conceptions of what is believed in evangelical Christendom. Mr. Ballard here and there talks a little wildly of Calvinism, but that was to be expected.

Another volume, written with a similar intention, but with somewhat more ambitious aims, is *Christian Theology v. Modern Theories*, by Rev. John Evans, B.A. (Elliot Stock). The standpoint of Mr. Evans may be inferred from his suggestion that the parts of *Daniel* which describe the fiery furnace and the den of lions are "strong metaphors descriptive of the severe trials and persecutions" through which the actors in these scenes passed. The narrative of the Fall he considers an allegory, and the standing still of the sun a poetical figure. But on the great doctrines of the Incarnation, Atonement, and Regeneration Mr. Evans is orthodox, and has much that is valuable to say. He certainly achieves his purpose of showing that evangelical teaching is reasonable.

The Gospel of a Risen Saviour, by the Rev. R. McCheyne Edgar, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland (T. & T. Clark), is a volume which deserves attention. It covers the whole subject of the Resurrection of our Lord, with all its many associated topics. There was quite room for such a book; for although the proof of the event has been frequently exhibited, and its significance and theological bearings pointed out, Mr. Edgar's work combines what has hitherto been scattered. As a text-book competently covering the entire subject it will be found of great value, and the bibliographical lists, which are as complete as need be, will guide any who may wish to pursue the subject. Mr. Edgar is a scholar, and a clear and forcible thinker; he has spared no pains to present

his subject adequately, and has succeeded in producing a book which will be serviceable to students as well as to laymen.

Mr. Robert Tuck is already well known as a writer whose books have furnished acceptable assistance to ministers and teachers. His present volume, *Revelation by Character* (Elliot Stock), consists of a study of the leading figures of the Old Testament which have served as "revelations" of this or that virtue or vice. Thus we have chapters on "Self-conscious Lot," "Talented Joseph," "Energetic Caleb," "Playful Samson," "Undisciplined Saul," and so forth. No doubt this fixing on the leading feature gives a sharper reality to the character, but it is also apt to blind one to its minor elements, and thus to produce a false estimate of the whole. This is especially the case in the chapter on "Wily Joab," in which less than justice is done to that much maligned character. Mr. Tuck's book should not be overlooked by those who seek for a vigorous treatment of the Old Testament figures.

From Boston (Lee & Shepard) we have received *God's Image in Man*, by Henry Wood. This is a book with which probably no one will entirely agree, but in which every one will find ideas. Mr. Wood aims at advancing spiritual religion by emancipating the Churches from the thralldom of erroneous views of the Bible and Theology. He understands what spiritual religion is, and his teaching all tends in the right direction.

In connection with their series of "Christian Classics" Messrs. Samuel Bagster & Sons issue a new translation of *The Imitation of Christ*. It is a small and well-printed volume, and should sell as a gift-book. The translation is generally, although not invariably accurate, and sometimes it is happy. But why have such sentences as the following been admitted: "What signifies it to make great disputation about hidden and obscure matters, when for ignorance of which we shall not be arraigned at the day of judgment?"

Prayer Thoughts, by the Rev. N. A. Garland, M.A. (Elliot Stock), may be recommended to those who feel the need of some stimulus to devotion. A brief meditation or prayer is founded upon some title of Christ, and unquestionably many reverent and devotional thoughts are suggested. These meditations are thrown into the form of verse. "They are but prose-poetry, without any pretensions to the pathos or fire of genuine verse; but they present

weighty truths in an abbreviated form, and they may furnish hints and set the mind in motion."

From Messrs. Griffith, Farran & Co. comes an anonymous volume entitled, *The Great Discourse of Jesus the Christ, the Son of God*. This is not an accurate title, for what we have in the book is really a topical arrangement of all the words of our Lord. The idea is excellent, but it is not well carried out.

Yet another attempt to reconcile Genesis and Science is issued by Mr. F. Hugh Capron. It is intended as a reply to Mr. S. Laing's *Modern Science and Modern Thought*, and is named *The Antiquity of Man* (Elliot Stock). It is certainly clever and ingenious, and makes some points against Mr. Laing, but it does not advance the study of Genesis.

In Prof. Rendel Harris's *Memoranda Sacra* Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have made a most felicitous commencement of their "Devotional Library." It consists of fifteen meditations on texts or themes. The one quality of the book which unfits it for a book of devotional pieces to be read day by day is that every one is sure to read it through at a sitting. The pieces are all full of ideas, they are expressed in clear and flexible English, are joyous in tone, and, above all, they have that most precious quality of individuality. There are passages in this small volume as powerful and searching as anything in Newman, fresh and truly illuminating lights shed upon hackneyed themes, a reverential insight into the spiritual life which cannot fail to quicken devotional feeling. Those who have hitherto merely classed Prof. Harris with our foremost scholars will question whether preaching is not his proper vocation. The appearance of the book is particularly attractive; it is printed by R. & R. Clark, and bound in the darkest blue buckram.

MARCUS DODS.

GALILEE.

THIS name, which binds together so many of the richest and most holy memories of our race, means by itself nothing but Ring, Circuit, District.¹ In so general a sense it was applicable anywhere; as, for example, to the district east of Jerusalem, which is called by Ezekiel *the Eastern Galilee*, or to *the Galilees of the Jordan*, or to *the Galilees of the Philistines*.² How it came to be the peculiar title of one district, and take rank among the most significant names of the world, was as follows. Gelil ha-Gôim,—*Ring or Region of the Gentiles*, a phrase analogous to the German “Heidenmark,” was applied to the northern border of Israel, which was pressed and permeated from three sides by foreign tribes. Thence the name gradually spread, till by Isaiah’s time it was as far south as the Lake of Gennesaret,—till by the time of the Maccabees it had reached the plain of Esdraelon, and covered the whole of the most northerly of the three provinces into which, after the Exile, the land west of Jordan was divided. The specification of *the Gentiles* was usually dropped, but the definite article, as throughout the Old and New Testaments, was retained. It was, we can understand, particularly pleasing to the

¹ גליל, Gālil, as the easily slipping letters testify, means anything that can roll or is round (cf. Gk. *κυλινδρον*), like balls, cylinders, or rings (Esth. i. 6; Cant. v. 14); or the leaf of a door turning on its hinge (1 Kings vi. 34).

² But in all these cases it was the feminine. הגלילה הקרמנה, the region to the east of Jerusalem (Ezek. xlvi. 8). Plural גלילות הירדן, the circles of Jordan (Josh. xxii. 10, 11); cf. “links of Forth.” גלילות פלשת (Joel iv. 4), circles of the Philistines (cf. Josh. xiii. 2).

patriotism of her proud inhabitants, to call their famous and beautiful province, *The Galilee, The Region*.¹

The natural boundaries of Galilee are obvious. South, the Plain of Esdraelon (and we have seen why this frontier should be the southern and not the northern edge of the plain²); north, the great gorge of the Leontes, cutting off Lebanon; east, the valley of the Jordan and the Lake of Gennesaret; and west, the narrow Phœnician coast. This region coincides pretty closely with the territories of four tribes—Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, and Naphtali. But the sea-coast, claimed for Zebulun and Asher, never belonged either to them or to the province of Galilee: it was always Gentile. On the other hand, owing to the weakness of the Samaritans, Carmel was reckoned to Galilee when it was not in the hands of the men of Tyre;³ and the eastern shores of Gennesaret also fell within the province.⁴ Exclusive of these two additions, Galilee measured about fifty miles north to south, and from twenty-five to thirty-five east and west. The area was only about 1,600 square miles, or that of a larger English shire.

From the intricacy of its highlands, the map of Galilee seems at first impossible to arrange to the eye. But with a little care the ruling features are distinguished, and the whole province falls into four divisions. There is the Jordan Valley with its two lakes—that singular chasm, which runs

¹ הגליל (Josh. xx. 7, xxi. 32; 1 Chron. vi. 61). ארץ הגליל (1 Kings ix. 11). הגליל הגויים (Isa. viii. 23). In 2 Kings xv. 29, ארץ הגליל, it is not the feminine form, but the masculine, with ה paragog., that is used. The feminine גלילה is not applied in Hebrew to Galilee (for its uses see previous note). But the LXX. render הגליל ἡ Γαλιλαία. In Isa. viii. 23 (LXX. and Eng. ix. 1) Γαλιλαία τῶν ἐθνῶν. In the Apocrypha it is Γαλιλαία Ἀλλόφυλων (cf. 1 Macc. v. 15, etc.). The definite article is omitted only in 1 Macc. x. 30. And so in the N.T. it is ἡ Γαλιλαία, the definite article being omitted only twice.

² EXPOSITOR for November, 1892.

³ Josephus, III. *Bell. Jud.*, iii. 1.

⁴ As at this day "the whole coast district is under the administration of the Kada Tubariya."—Schumacher, *The Jaulán*, p. 103. It is the most convenient arrangement.

along the east of Galilee, sinking from Hermon's base to more than 700 feet below the level of the ocean.¹ From this valley, and corresponding roughly to its three divisions, —below the Lake of Tiberias, the lake itself, and above the lake,—three belts or strips run westward; *first*, the Plain of Esdraelon; *second*, the so-called Lower Galilee, a series of long parallel ranges, all below 1,815 feet, which, with broad valleys between them, cross from the plateau above Tiberias to the maritime plains of Haifa and Acre; and *third*, Upper Galilee,² a square plateau surrounded by hills from 2,000 to 4,000 feet. As you gaze north from the Samaritan border, these three zones rise in steps above one another to the beginnings of Lebanon; and from the north-east, over the gulf of the Jordan, the snowy head of Hermon looks down athwart them.

The controlling feature of Galilee is her relation to these great mountains. A native of the region has reflected it in a figure he gives of God's grace. *I will be as the dew unto Israel; he shall blossom as the lily, and cast forth his roots like Lebanon.*³ Galilee is literally the *casting forth of the roots of Lebanon*. As the supports of a great oak run up above ground, so the gradual hills of Galilee rise from

¹ Opposite Bethshean.

² The division between Upper and Lower Galilee is very evident on the map. It runs, roughly speaking, from the north end of the Lake of Galilee (or to the south of Safed), by the Wady Maktul leading up from the Plain of Gennesaret, thence by the level ground between Kefr Anân and ers Rameh due west towards Acre. South of this line there is no height of over 1,850 feet, the peaks run from 1,000 to 1,800, with Jebel es Sih 1,838, and Tabor 1,843. But north of this line the steep constant wall of the northern plateau rises almost immediately, and figures from 2,000 to 3,000 are frequent on the map. The Talmud marks this line of division as follows: "Upper Galilee above Kefr Hananyah, a country where sycamores are not found; Lower Galilee below Kefr Hananyah, which produces sycamores" (quoted by Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, p. 178). Kefr Hananyah is no doubt the present Kefr Anân. Josephus gives the breadth of Lower Galilee (north and south) as from Xaloth, at the roots of Tabor to Berseba, which has not been identified, but which may be the present Kh. Abu esh Sheba in the immediate neighbourhood of Kefr Anân.

³ Hosea xiv. 5.

Esdraelon and Jordan and the Phœnician coast upon that tremendous northern mountain. It is not Lebanon, however, but the opposite range of Hermon, which dominates the view. Among his own roots Lebanon is out of sight; whereas that long glistening ridge, standing aloof, always brings the eye back to itself. In the heat of summer harvesters from every field lift their hearts to Hermon's snow; and heavy dews by night they call his gift. How closely Hermon was identified with Galilee, is seen from his association with the most characteristic of the Galilæan hills: *Tabor and Hermon rejoice in Thy name.*¹

To her dependence upon Lebanon Galilee owes her water and fruitfulness, and her immense superiority in these respects over Judæa. In Galilee *when ye see a cloud rise out of the west, straightway ye say, There cometh a shower.*² But outside the rainy season, showers are here almost as few as in the rest of Palestine, whereas the waters, seen and unseen, which the westerly winds lavish on Lebanon are stored by him for Galilee's sake, and dispensed to her with unfailing regularity all round the year. They break out in the full-born rivers of the upper Jordan Valley, and the wealth of wells among all her hills. When Judæa is utterly dry they feed the streams of Gennesaret and Esdraelon. In winter the springs of Kishon burst so richly from the ground, that the Great Plain about Tabor is a quagmire; but even in summer there are fountains in Esdraelon, round which the thickets keep green; and in the glens running up to Lower Galilee the paths cross rivulets and sometimes wind round a marsh. In the long cross valleys, winter lakes last till July,³ and further north the even

¹ Psalm lxxx. 9-12. How far they believed its influence to travel may be seen from that other Psalm: "*The dew of Hermon that cometh down on the mountains of Zion*" (Psa. cxxxiii.).

² Luke xii. 54.

³ So the Plain of Buttauf was in that month still partly a lake. Conder's *Tent Work*.

autumn streams descend both water-sheds with a music unheard in southern Palestine. In fact, the difference in this respect between Galilee and Judæa is just the difference between their names—the one liquid and musical like her running waters, the other dry and dead like the fall of your horse's hoof on her blistered and muffled rock.

So much water means an exuberant fertility. We have seen what Esdraelon is, and we may leave for separate treatment the almost tropic regions of the Jordan Valley. But take lower and upper Galilee with their more temperate climate. They are almost as well-wooded as our own land. Tabor is covered with bush, and large, loose groves of forest trees. The road, which goes up from the Bay of Carmel to Nazareth, winds, as among English glades, with open groves of oak and an abundance of flowers and grass. Often, indeed, as about Nazareth, the limestone breaks out not less bare and dusty than in Judea itself, but over the most of Lower Galilee there is a profusion of bush, with scattered forest trees,—holly-oak, maple, sycamore, bay-tree, myrtle, arbutus, sumac, and others,—and in the valleys olive orchards and stretches of fat corn-land. Except for some trees like the sycamore, Upper Galilee is quite as rich. It is “an undulating tableland, arable, and everywhere tilled, with swelling hills in view all round, covered with shrubs and trees.”¹ Round Jotapata, Josephus speaks of timber being cut down for the town's defence.² Gischala was Gush-halab, Fat-soil,³ and was noted for its oil. Throughout the province olives were so abundant that a proverb ran, “It is easier to raise a legion of olives in Galilee than to bring up a child in Palestine.”⁴ Even on

¹ Robinson, *Later Researches*.

² III. *Bell. Jud.*, vii. 8, cf. vi. 2.

³ Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*.

⁴ *Talmud*, quoted by Neubauer, p. 180. The abundance of oil in Galilee is well illustrated in the use made of boiling oil by the defenders of Jotapata, who poured great quantities of it on the Roman soldiers (III. *Bell. Jud.*, vii. 28).

the high water-parting between Huleh and the Mediterranean the fields are fertile, while the ridges are covered with forests of small oaks. To the inhabitants of such a land, the more luxuriant vegetation of the hot plains on either side spreads its temptations in vain.

*Asher, his bread is fat,
And he yieldeth the dainties of a king.
Blessed be Asher above the children,
And let him dip his foot in oil!
O Naphtali, satisfied with favour,
And full of the blessing of the Lord.¹*

But it is luxury where luxury cannot soften. On these broad heights, open to the sunshine and the breeze, life is free and exhilarating.

Naphtali is as a hind let loose.²

This beautiful figure fully expresses the feelings that are bred by the health, the spaciousness, the high freedom, and the glorious prospects of Upper Galilee.

To so generous a land the inhabitants, during that part of her history which concerns us, responded with energy. "Their soil," says Josephus, "is universally rich and fruitful, and full of the plantations of trees of all sorts, insomuch that it invites by its fruitfulness the most slothful to take pains in its cultivation. Accordingly it is all cultivated by its inhabitants, and no part of it lies idle."³ The villages were frequent, there were many fortified towns, and the

¹ Gen. xlix. 20; Deut. xxxiii. 23, 24.

² Gen. xlix. 21. Another reading, partly suggested by the LXX., is adopted by Ewald, Dillmann, and others, *Naphtali is a slender terebinth giving forth goodly boughs*. Other ancient versions, however, support the Massoretic text; and while, as we have seen, the figure of a tree is not inapplicable to the mountains of Naphtali, that of a slender tree is quite absurd. The ordinary reading is, as shown above, beautifully expressive of a people in the position of Naphtali.

³ III. *Bell. Jud.*, iii. 2.

population was very numerous. We may not accept all that Josephus reports in these matters—he reckons a population of nearly three millions—but there are good reasons for the possibility of his high figures;¹ and in any case the province was very thickly peopled. Save in the recorded hours of our Lord's praying, the history of Galilee has no intervals of silence and loneliness; the noise of a close and busy life is always audible; and to every crisis in the Gospels and in Josephus we see crowds immediately swarm.

One other natural feature of Galilee must not be passed over. The massive limestone of her range is broken here and there by volcanic extrusions—an extinct crater, for instance, near Gischala,² dykes of basalt and scatterings of lava upon the plateau above the lake. Hot sulphur springs flow by Tiberias, and the whole province has been shaken by terrible earthquakes.³ The nature of the people was also volcanic. Josephus describes them as “ever fond of innovations, and by nature disposed to changes, and delighting in seditions.”⁴ They had an ill name for quarrelling. From among them came the chief zealots and wildest fanatics of the Roman wars. We remember two Galilæans, who wished to call down fire from heaven on those who were only discourteous to them.⁵ Yet this inner fire is an essential of manhood. It burns the meanness out of men, and can flash forth in great passions for righteousness and freedom. From first to last the Galilæans were a chivalrous and a gallant race.

¹ See those given by Dr. Selah Merrill in his valuable monograph on *Galilee in the Time of Christ*. “Bypaths of Bible Knowledge” series, London, 1891.

² Sahel-el-Gish.

³ The most recent was that in 1837, which overthrew the walls of Tiberias, and killed so large a number of the population of Safed and other towns.

⁴ *Life*, 17. Cf. *Antiq.*, XVII. x. 5, XX. vi. 1; *Bell. Jud.*, I. xvi. 5, II. xvii. 8; Tacitus, *Ann.*, xii. 54.

⁵ Luke ix. 54. Cf. Josephus, XX. *Antiq.* vi. 1.

*Zebulun was a people jeoparding their life to the death,
And Naphtali on the high places of the field.*¹

With the same desperate zeal their sons attempted the forlorn hope of breaking the Roman power. "The country," says Josephus proudly, "hath never been destitute of men of courage."² Their fidelity, often unreasoning and ill-tempered, was always sincere. "The Galilæans," according to the Talmud, "were more anxious for honour than for money—the contrary was true of Judæa."³ For this cause also our Lord chose His friends from the people; and it was *not* a Galilæan who betrayed Him.

When we turn from the physical characteristics of this province of the subterranean fires and waters to her political geography, we find influences as bold and inspiring, as those we have noted. I select three—the neighbourhood of classic scenes of Hebrew history; the great world-roads which crossed Galilee; the surrounding heathen civilisations.

I. It is often taken for granted that the Galilee of our Lord's day was a new land with an illegitimate people—without history, without traditions, without prophetic succession. The notion is inspired by such proverbs as, *Search and see, for out of Galilee cometh no prophet! Can any good come out of Nazareth?* But these utterances were due to the spitfire pride of Judæa, that had contempt for the coarse dialect of the Galilæans,⁴ and for their intercourse with the heathen. Galilee had traditions, a prophetic succession, and a history almost as splendid as Judah's own. She was not out of the way of the great scenes of famous days. Carmel, Kishon, Megiddo, Jezreel, Gilboa, Shunem, Tabor, Gilead, Bashan, the waters of Merom,

¹ Jud. v. 18.

² III. *Bell. Jud.*, iii. 2.

³ Quoted by Neubauer, *Géog. du Tal u*, 181.

⁴ The Galilæans confounded the gutturals, and were guilty of other solecisms.

Hazor, and Kadesh, were all within touch or sight. She shared with Judæa even the exploits of the Maccabees. By Gennesaret was Jonathan's march, by Merom the scene of his heroic rally, when his forces were in flight, and of his great victory; on the other side, at Ptolemais, was his treacherous capture, the beginning of his martyrdom.¹ Galilee, therefore, lived, as openly as Judæa, in face of the glories of their people. Her latent fires had everywhere visible provocation. The foot of the invader could tread no league of her soil without starting the voices of fathers who had laboured and fought for her—without reawakening promises which the greatest prophets had lavished upon her future. *As in the former time he brought into contempt the land of Zebulun, and the land of Naphtali, so in the latter time hath he made them glorious; the way of the sea, across Jordan; Galilee of the Gentiles. The people which walked in darkness have seen a great light; dwellers in the land of darkness, on them hath the light shined.*

It is not necessary to enlarge upon the preparation which all this must have effected for the ministry of our Lord. That the Messianic tempers were stronger in Galilæan, than in any other Jewish, hearts is almost certain. While Judæa's religion had for its characteristic zeal for the law, Galilee's was distinguished by the nobler, the more potential passion of hope. Therefore it was to Galilee that Jesus came preaching that *the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand*, and it was the Galilæan patriotism which he chose to refine to diviner issues.

But we usually overlook that Galilee was vindicated also in the affections of the Jews themselves. It is one of the most singular revolutions, even in Jewish history, that the province, which through so many centuries Judæa had contemned as profane and heretical, should succeed Judæa as the sanctuary of the race and the home of their theo-

¹ 1 Macc. ix.

logical schools—that to-day Galilee should have as many holy places as Judæa, and Safed and Tiberias be revered along with Hebron and Jerusalem. The transference can be traced, geographically, by the movements of the Sanhedrim. After the defeat of the last Jewish revolt at Bethsur, the Sanhedrim migrated north from Jabneh in the Philistine plain to Osheh just north of Carmel, and thence gradually eastward across Lower Galilee to Shaphram, to Beth She'arim, to Sepphoris—nay to the unclean and cursed Tiberias itself. Here the last Sanhedrim sat, and the Mishna was edited. You see the tomb of Maimonides in Tiberias, and most of the towns of Lower and some of those of Upper Galilee have a name as the scenes of the residence or of the martyrdom of famous Rabbis. It is curious to observe in the Talmud the reflection of a state of society in Galilee of the third century more strict in many respects than that of Judæa. But, in the history of Israel, the last is ever becoming the first.¹

II. The next great features of Galilee are her Roads. This garden of the Lord is crossed by many of the world's most famous highways. Judæa, we saw, was on the road to nowhere, Galilee is covered with roads to everywhere—roads from the harbours of the Phœnician coast to Samaria, Gilead, the Hauran and Damascus; roads from Sharon to the valley of the Jordan; roads from the sea to the desert; roads from Egypt to Assyria. The passage of these was not confined to Esdraelon and the Jordan Valley. They ran over Lower Galilee by its long parallel valleys, and even crossed the high plateau of Upper Galilee on the shortest direction from Tyre and Sidon to Damascus.

¹ For the above details see Neubauer, *Géog. du Talmud*, 177-233. A most valuable picture of Galilee, but he draws too much on the Talmud's picture of Galilee for illustration of the very different state of affairs in our Lord's time. The towns mentioned above will all be found on the last map of the P. E. F. Osheh is Khurbet Hushch, and Shaphram Shefa 'Amr only two miles away. Beth She'arim has not been identified.

A review of these highways will immensely enhance our appreciation of Galilee's history. They can be traced by the current lines of traffic, by the great khans or caravan-serais which still exist, in use or in ruin, and by the remains of Roman pavements.

From the earliest times to the present a great thoroughfare has connected Damascus with the sea. Its direction, of course, has varied from age to age according to political circumstances. The port of Damascus was sometimes Aleppo, sometimes Beyrout, sometimes Sidon, or Tyre, sometimes Acca with Haifa. But between the three first of these and Damascus rises the double range of Lebanon; the roads have twice over to climb many thousands of feet. To Tyre again the road must cross the heights of Naphtali from Baniyas or Hasbeya, on the present tourist tracks over the buttresses of Hermon. Acca alone is the natural port for Damascus, and the nearest ways to Acca run through Lower Galilee. Leaving Damascus, the highway kept to the south of Hermon upon the level region of Ituræa,¹ and crossed the Jordan midway between the Lakes of Merom and Gennesaret at the present Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob. Thence it climbed to the Khan, now called "of the Pit of Joseph," and divided. One branch held west past Safed, by the line of valley between Lower and Upper Galilee, and came down by the present Wady Waziyeh upon Acca.² Another branch went south to the Lake of Gennesaret at Khan Minyeh—one of the possible sites for Capernaum—and there forked again. One prong bent up the Plain of Gennesaret and the present Wady Rubadiyeh to rejoin the direct western branch at Rameh.³ Another left the Plain of Gennesaret up the famous Wady el Hamam by Arbela⁴ to the plateau above Tiberias, and

¹ The present Jedur, by S'asa and el Kuneitra.

² Schumacher, *P. E. F. Quart. Statem.*, 1889, pp. 79, 80.

³ *Ibid.*

⁴ Modern Irbid. See 1 Macc. ix.

thence passing the great Khan or market, now called et Tuggar "of the merchants," defiled between Tabor and the Nazareth hills upon Esdraelon, which it crossed to Megiddo, on the way to Sharon, to Philistia, to Egypt. A third branch from Khan Minyeh continued due south by the Lake and Tiberias to Bethshean, from which the traveller might either ascend Esdraelon and rejoin the straight route to Egypt, or go up through Samaria to Jerusalem, or down Jordan to Jericho. But at Bethshean, or a little to the north of it, there came across Jordan another great road from Damascus. It had traversed the level Hauran, and come down into the valley of the Jordan, by Aphek¹ or by Gamala, and it went over to the Mediterranean either by Esdraelon or up the Wady Feggas to the plateau above the Lake, and thence by the cross valley past Cana and Sepphoris to Acca. This was also the way over Galilee from Gilead and the Decapolis.²

The Great West Road from Damascus to the Mediterranean, in one or other of its branches, was the famous *Way of the Sea*. It was probably so called by Isaiah when he heard along it the grievous march of the Assyrian armies, *by way of the sea, over Jordan, Galilee of the nations*. I say probably, for the phrase is ambiguous in both its terms; it is doubtful whether *the sea* is Gennesaret or the Mediterranean, and whether *the way* be really a road or only a direction. If the two latter alternatives be taken, the phrase means no more than westward—a rendering suitable to the context.³ However this be, later generations

¹ The present Fik.

² In Roman times there were two bridges, one just below the lake, the other the present Gisir el-Mugamia.

³ Isa. viii. 22 (Eng. version ix. 1) הַיָּם הַיָּרְדֵּן *The Way of the Sea*. (1) The usual interpretation is that Gennesaret is meant (יַם־בִּזְרֵת), Num. xxxiv. 11) and *the way of the sea*, along with the following words עֲבַר הַיָּרְדֵּן, *over Jordan*, is taken to mean a district to the east of the Lake of Galilee. But the tribes mentioned—Zebulun and Naphtali—had their territories to the west of Jordan: and עֲבַר הַיָּרְדֵּן is applicable to either side of the river. The march of the

applied Isaiah's words to the great caravan route between Damascus and the sea, and throughout the Middle Ages it was known as the "Via Maris." The Romans paved it and took taxes from its traffic; at one of its tolls, in Capernaum, Matthew *sat at the receipt of custom*. It was then the great route of trade with the Far East. From the eleventh to the fourteenth centuries the products of India coming via Baghdad and Damascus, were carried along it to the Venetian and Genoese agencies in Acca and thence distributed through Europe.¹ The commerce of Damascus has at present an easier way to Beyrout by the splendid Alpine road which the French engineers built across the Lebanon; but the Via Maris is still used for the considerable exports on camel-back of grain from the Hauran.²

The Great South Road, the road for Egypt, which diverged from the Via Maris at the Lake of Galilee, was equally used for traffic and for war from the days of the patriarchs down to our own. One afternoon in 1891, while we were resting in the dale at the foot of Tabor, three

Assyrians, which is here described, swept westward. But (2) does *way* mean an actual *highway*? I am inclined to think that it means no more than direction, and that we ought to take הַיָּם, or sea, in its general sense of the West, so that the phrase in analogy to הַיָּם הַיָּבֵשׁ (Ezek. viii. 5, xxi. 2, xl. 6) would mean simply *westward*. In that case it would be equivalent to the phrase בְּעֶקֶר הַיַּרְדֵּן יָמִינָה (Josh. v. 1, etc.), *across the Jordan westwards*. It is true, however, that in these last cases the particle of *direction towards* is used; whereas in our verse *sea* is used in the genitive case with the definite article, a construction that would point to its being the title of a real road rather than the description of a direction. If that be so, it is more probable that the Mediterranean—the goal of the road—would give its name to the latter, than that the Lake of Gennesaret, along which only one of the road's branches passed, would do so.

¹ Heyd, *Die Italienischen Handelscolonien in Palästina*, quoted by Schnmacher.

² A party encamped at the Bridge of the Daughters of Jacob during the harvest of 1890 gave orders to their watchman to count the camels passing the bridge laden with grain. He told them in the morning that the string of camels had not ceased all night. Those who have passed through the Hauran in harvest will understand this. I counted one evening nearly two hundred loaded camels pass our tent at Ghabaghib on the Haj road.

great droves of camels, unladen, passed by. We asked the drivers, "Where from?" "Damascus." "And where are you going?" "Jaffa and Gaza; but if we do not get the camels sold there, we shall drive them down to Egypt." How ancient a succession these men were following! From Abraham's time, every year that war was not afoot on this road, have camels for sale passed down it to Egypt. Armies sometimes marched by it, as, for instance, the Syrians when Jonathan Maccabeus went out against them in the defiles by Arbela above Gennesaret.¹ But the open road by the Hauran and across the Jordan below the Lake seems to have been the more usual line of invasion. So the Syrians came in Ahab's time,² and probably also the Assyrians when they advanced by Damascus.

The Great Road of the South-east (as we may call it) from Acre across Lower Galilee to Bethshean, and over the Jordan into Gilead, was the road for Arabia. Up it have come through all ages the Midianites, the children of the East. In the Roman period it connected the Asian frontier of the Empire with the capital. Chariots, military troops, companies of officials and merchants, passed by this road, between the Greek cities east of Jordan, and Acre, called Ptolemais, the port for Rome.

Of all things in Galilee it was the sight of these immemorial roads that taught and moved me most—not because they were trodden by the patriarchs, and some of them must soon shake to the railway train, not because the chariots of Assyria and Rome have both rolled along them—but because it was up and down these roads that the immortal figures of the Parables passed—the merchantman seeking goodly pearls, the king departing to receive his kingdom, the friend on a journey, the householder arriving suddenly upon his servants, the prodigal son coming back

¹ Macc. ix. 2. So also came Saladin's army, in 1187, to the Battle of Hattin.

² 1 Kings xx., xxii.

from the far off country. The far off country! What a meaning has this frequent phrase of Christ's, when you stand in Galilee by one of her great roads—roads that so easily carried willing feet from the pious homes of Asher and Naphtali to the harlot cities of Phœnicia—roads that were in touch with Rome and with Babylon.

III. Her roads naturally carry us out upon the surroundings of Galilee. In the neighbourhood of Judæa we saw great deserts, some of which came up almost to the gates of the cities, and impressed their austerity and foreboding of judgment upon the feelings and the literature of the people. The very different temperament of the Galilæan was explained in part by his very different environment. The desert is nowhere even visible from Galilee. Instead of it, Galilee in our Lord's time had as her close and infective neighbours the half Greek land of Phœnicia, with its mines and manufactures, its open ports, its traffic with the West; the fertile Hauran, Auranitis, with its frequent cities, where the Greek language was spoken, and the pagan people worshipped their old divinities under the names of the Greek gods; and Gilead, with the Decapolis, ten cities (more or less) of stately forums, amphitheatres, and temples. We shall see the full influence of all this when we go down to the Lake of Galilee. Meantime let us remember that Galilee was not surrounded by *desert places* haunted by demoniacs, which is all that the few traces in the Gospels suggest to the imagination of most of us; but that the background and environment of this stage of our Lord's ministry was thronged and very gay,—that it was Greek in all the name can bring up to us of busy life, imposing art and sensuous religion. The effect upon the Galilæan temperament is obvious.

These then are the influences which geography reveals bearing upon Galilee. Before we go down to the Lake,

let us focus them upon the one town away from the Lake, which is of supreme interest to us—Nazareth.

Nazareth is usually represented as a secluded and obscure village. Many writers on the life of our Lord have emphasised this, holding it to be proved by the silence of the Gospels concerning His childhood and youth. But the use of a vision of the Holy land is that it fills the silences of the Holy Book, and from it we receive a very different idea of the early life of our Lord than has been generally current among us.¹

The position of Nazareth is familiar to all. The village lies on the farthest south of the ranges of Lower Galilee, and on the southern edge of this, just above the Plain of Esdraelon. You cannot see from it the surrounding country, for it rests in a wide basin in the hills; but the moment you climb to the edge of this basin, which is everywhere within the limit of the village boys' playground, what a view you get! Esdraelon lies before you, with its twenty battle fields—the scenes of Barak's and of Gideon's victories, the scenes of Saul's and Josiah's defeats, the scenes of struggles for freedom in the glorious days of the Maccabees. There is Naboth's vineyard and the field of Jehu's revenge upon Jezebel; there is Shunem and the house of Elisha; there Carmel and the place of Elijah's sacrifice. To the East the Valley of Jordan, with the long range of Gilead; to the West the radiance of the Great Sea, with the ships of Tarshish and the promise of the Isles. You see thirty miles in three directions. It is a map of Old Testament history.

But equally rich was the present life on which the eyes of the boy Jesus looked out. Across Esdraelon, opposite to Nazareth, there emerged from the Samaritan hills the road from Jerusalem, thronged annually with pilgrims,

¹ It is a great merit of Dr. Merrill's monograph on Galilee, that it has disproved this error in detail.

and the road from Egypt with its merchants going up and down. The Midianite caravans could be watched for miles coming up from the fords of Jordan; and, as we have seen, the caravans from Damascus wound round the foot of the hill on which Nazareth stands. Or if the village boys climbed the northern edge of their home, there was another road almost within sight, where the companies were still more brilliant—that direct highway between Acre and the Decapolis, along which legions marched, and princes swept with their retinues, and all sorts of travellers from all countries went to and fro. The Roman ranks, the Roman eagles, the wealth of noblemen's litters and equipages cannot have been strange to the eyes of the boys of Nazareth, especially after their twelfth year, when they went up to Jerusalem, or visited with their fathers famous Rabbis, who came down from Jerusalem, peripatetic among the provinces. Nor can it have been the eye only which was stirred. For all the rumour of the Empire entered Palestine close to Nazareth—the news from Rome, about the Emperor's health,¹ about the changing influence of the great statesmen, about the prospects at court of Herod, or of the Jews; about Cæsar's last order concerning the tribute, or whether the policy of the Procurator would be sustained. Many Galilæan families must have had relatives in Rome; Jews would come back to this countryside to tell of the life of the world's capital. Moreover, the scandals of the Herods buzzed up and down these roads; pedlars carried them, and the peripatetic Rabbis would moralise upon them. And the customs, too, of the neighbouring Gentiles,—their loose living, their sensuous worship, their absorption in business,² the hopelessness of the inscriptions on their tombs, multitudes of which were readable (as some

¹ As in the days when Vespasian was encamped in Galilee. See both Josephus and Tacitus.

² Matt. vi. 32.

are still) on the roads round Galilee—all this would furnish endless talk in Nazareth, both among men and boys.

Here then He grew up and suffered temptation, Who was tempted in all points like as we are, yet without sin. The perfect example of His purity and patience was achieved—not easily as behind a wide fence which shut the world out—but amid rumour and scandal and every provocation to unlawful curiosity and premature ambition. A vision of all the kingdoms of the world was as possible from Nazareth as from the Mount of Temptation. The pressure and problems of the world outside God's people must have been felt by the youth of Nazareth as by few others; yet the scenes of prophetic missions to it—Elijah's and Elisha's—were also within sight.¹ But the chief lesson which Nazareth has for us is the possibility of a pure home and a spotless youth in the very face of the evil world.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

¹ Luke iv. 25 ff.

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

II.

THE SUPPOSED RELATION OF ST. MATTHEW AND ST. LUKE
TO THE "LOGIA" AS A COMMON SOURCE.

THE common features of all the first three Gospels, and their broad differences from the Fourth, are the phenomena which first strike us in comparing the Gospels. And I contended in my last paper, that, in spite of what has been recently urged, this contrast finds its most natural explanation in the characteristics of the earliest, the oral, stage in the delivery of the Gospel. I granted that our first and third evangelists seem to have had St. Mark's Gospel, or one very like it, before them as they wrote. But we saw that some force has to be supposed which caused them to be satisfied with the general character of its representation, and which controlled their choice of additional matter, or determined the supply of it at their disposal. Such a force we have if at the time when all three Synoptists wrote there was a prevailing type and outline of teaching to which preachers and catechists in the main conformed in popularly imparting the facts of the Gospel.

If I were attempting a comprehensive discussion of the problem of the Origin of the Gospels, the relations of the Gospels according to St. Matthew and St. Luke to that according to St. Mark would next demand careful consideration. The proofs of that belief that it was the first of the three, and that the other two have made use of it, to which I have referred, would have to be exhibited. But this is a point on which much may be found in works accessible to all.¹ Moreover, my main object in these papers is to ex-

¹ *E.g.* see Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, chap. ix.

amine some of those conclusions of recent critics which seem to me most open to doubt. The extent of the relations of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark will, however, be incidentally referred to in the course of my argument as a standard of comparison in other cases.

Dr. Sanday has told us that "the two-document hypothesis holds the field."¹ This, to quote Dr. Sanday's description of it, is "the hypothesis that at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents—a narrative by St. Mark composed from the preaching of St. Peter, and a collection of our Lord's discourses first put together by St. Matthew."² Not only is it the theory maintained, though in different forms, by Holtzmann and Weiss and Wendt, but it is also, he tells us, "the common postulate" of certain recent writers whom he has noticed in the same article, "of Mr. Carpenter and Mr. Wright in England, and of Dr. Ewald and Dr. Resch in Germany."³ It may be questioned whether it is proper to use the term "two-document" in the case of a writer who, like Mr. Wright, endeavours to solve the Synoptic problem by an elaborate system of modifications of *oral* traditions. This, however, may be allowed to pass, as it is on the ground of Mr. Wright's view of the inter-relations of the Synoptists and of the sources of their material that Dr. Sanday classes him with the other writers.

It is a consideration of more importance that in the description of the "two-document" theory given above the words, "at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents," apply with very varying degrees of accuracy to the views of the different critics named. For while Wendt, for example, derives nearly the whole of the large amount of matter peculiar to St. Luke, as well as that

¹ EXPOSITOR for February, 1891, p. 91.

² *Ib.*

³ *Ib.*

which he and St. Matthew (but not St. Mark) contain, from the "Logia," so that he may be strictly called an adherent of the "two-document hypothesis,"—Weiss, and now Ewald, hold that St. Luke had a *third* source, special to himself, besides St. Mark and the "Logia." And Dr. Sanday himself in the same article made still further use of the hypothesis of a source peculiar to Luke,¹ till the "Logia" seems, as far as that Evangelist is concerned, in danger of being driven to take a very subordinate position. Some of these differences, however, do not matter for our present purpose, as they relate to points which do not come into view till the question of the common use of the "Logia" has been decided. It is the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke which has suggested this common source, and which (if the general fact is considered established) must ever be the main guide to its character and contents.

It requires some courage to call in question the soundness of a theory which has won the assent of a large number of the most thorough investigators in this field of New Testament criticism, and thus to render oneself liable to the imputation of desiring to impede the progress of criticism and the general acceptance of its conclusions. Nor am I insensible to the attractiveness of the theory. The attempt to reconstruct a lost document by a careful analysis and comparison of later writings which have preserved fragments of it, or otherwise used it, is not in itself illegitimate, and the hope of effecting this has a singular charm for the mind of the critic. More particularly must this be the case when, as in the present instance, we should thus obtain a clearer view of that which is most original and most to be relied upon in the sources of our knowledge concerning the Christ. But the very fascination which such a theory must possess is a reason for meeting it with peculiar caution. It

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1891, p. 315. And see more below.

is hard to restrict the imagination to its true office in such inquiries. When once we have thought ourselves into a particular theory, a conviction of its truth is apt to be bred in the mind, which is altogether beyond the evidence, while inconvenient facts are ignored.

Now the opposed conceptions of the character of the "Logia" and of the relation of St. Matthew and St. Luke to this document, which different critics have formed, should from the outset act as a warning that no one of the theories does justice to the facts as a whole, and that one set of facts will be found to have been neglected in one theory, another set in another. And here I may be allowed to observe that Dr. Sanday's mode of describing the present position of the inquiry seems too much to obscure this consideration. He includes "the two-document hypothesis" apparently among "points proved or probable"; and then indicates the two main views that are held of the relations of our first and third Gospels severally to the supposed original "collection of discourses" by St. Matthew, and mentions some of the difficulties in the way of each which may incline us to adopt the other.¹ He seems to say to us, "Here are all these able critics agreeing in the assumption that our first and third evangelists used another common source besides St. Mark. This much must be considered proved, or in the highest degree probable. The further question whether the first or the third represents this document most truly is one about which they widely differ. A good deal may be said on both sides; it must be regarded at present as an undecided point."

Now if the diversity consisted simply in the treatment of subsidiary and detached points, this might be so. But, in fact, it penetrates to the grounds on which the theory that the two evangelists both used the "Logia" can be justified

¹ Articles II. and III., *EXPOSITOR* for March and April, 1891.

at all. And the reasons which the advocates of each may urge against the other seem to be in combination destructive of the hypothesis which underlies them both. If the two evangelists both used the "Logia," their relations to it must be conceived in one of two opposite ways. We successively try each of these, and find that a different set of very serious difficulties exists in each case. The natural result must be, and ought to be, to throw grave doubt (that I may say no more) on the assumption from which we started.

Let us proceed to examine the alternative explanations in the light of general probability: (1) In respect to the different arrangement of the common matter in the first and third Gospels; (2) To differences of expression and detail. We will then notice (3) How the difficulties, to which each explanation is exposed, even when we confine ourselves simply to considerations of general probability, are enhanced by calling to mind how the first and third evangelists appear to have acted in the use which we may on much better grounds believe them to have made of St. Mark's narrative.

1. The general character of the arrangement of the common matter in the first Gospel is that it is massed in a few discourses, whereas in the third Gospel it is much more distributed, the occasions being given on which different sayings and passages of teaching were spoken. Holtzmann has represented in forcible language what violence we must suppose St. Luke to have done to his authority, if the grouping of the matter in that authority corresponded, even generally, with that in our St. Matthew.¹ And I would ask those who adopt this latter hypothesis, Can they really imagine that St. Luke broke up and scattered large portions of the discourses which he found in the "Logia," and in-

¹ See, for example, the words quoted by Sanday, *EXPOSITOR*, 1891, p. 307.

vented incidents to form settings for the fragments? For my own part I find such a supposition wholly inconsistent with his general characteristics as a writer. Will it be said: "He did not invent them, but he found them already existing in oral tradition, or in some written source open to him, where sayings like those in the "Logia" were already connected with them. By these and other means of information, he assigned the occasions for the teaching, the verbal form of which he took from the "Logia." But what a clumsy and improbable mode of workmanship is thus attributed to St. Luke! Surely we shall obtain a more reasonable hypothesis if we suppose that he found in some other written source, if not in oral tradition, the several pieces of instruction, or sayings, with the events that called them forth, just as he has given them.

We see, then, to what difficulties we shall be exposed, if assuming the "Logia" to be a source used both in the first and the third Gospel, we refuse to frame our conception of the order and division of the contents of this source mainly from the latter. Suppose, then, we agree to take our idea of the "Logia" primarily from St. Luke; does this create no grave difficulties in regard to St. Matthew's relation to the document? To begin with, there is the objection urged by Weiss,¹ and Ewald,² and Sanday,³ that if the original form of that which was related in St. Matthew's work was so much less faithfully preserved in our first than in the third Gospel, it is incomprehensible how the former of these should from a very early time have been universally identified with St. Matthew's name. It is true, Wendt and others, who derive their idea of the outline of the "Logia" from St. Luke, think that our St. Matthew has in some cases kept more closely than St. Luke has to turns of ex-

¹ *Introduction to New Test.*, II., p. 235 n. 1, Eng. Trans.

² *Hauptproblem*, p. 29.

³ *EXPOSITOR*, 1891, p. 308.

pression in the Source.¹ But even if this greater verbal accuracy extended to his reproductions generally, it would not have struck the eye nearly so much as the great differences of arrangement. This, however, is not the only difficulty in the way of supposing that the general form of the "Logia" is most truly represented in St. Luke. At first sight it may seem that the amount of violence done to the Source by the supposed massing of discourses and sayings with regard to their subject-matter, to bring them to the shape in which we find them in the first Gospel, would be decidedly less serious than that which the alternative hypothesis involves. But in reality the difference is not so great. It may be admitted that even if St. Luke in the main followed the assumed Source in the setting which he gives to the discourses and sayings which he has taken from it, yet the connexion and circumstances might conceivably in some instances have been more slightly indicated there than they are by him. And to this extent a regrouping might necessitate a less marked breach with the original authority than the reader of our present Gospels might be disposed to imagine. But the cases are far too numerous, and many of the occasions with which St. Luke connects them are far too distinct, for this explanation to suffice. If the writer of our first Gospel, finding our Lord's teaching about prayer reported in the "Logia" on a separate and specified occasion, represented it as a part of the Sermon on the Mount; if again he treated in a similar manner the warning against being careful for worldly things, which in the "Logia" was seen to have been called forth by a special incident; if he combined two discourses to different bodies of disciples, fused various denunciations of the Pharisees into one, made one discourse out of various sayings on the Things of the End, although the Source implied that

¹ See Wendt's *Lehre Jesu*, e.g. pp. 85, 86, 88, 97, etc.

they were spoken at different times, then he on his part feigned the occasions on which the portions of teaching which he so transferred were delivered, in defiance of an authority which he had strong reason to follow.

So far our attention has been directed to the massing of material in the discourses given by St. Matthew, which in St. Luke is scattered. A few chief instances have been indicated; a fuller examination of the principal discourses in St. Matthew and the parallels to their contents in St. Luke would confirm what has been already said as to the strange difference of grouping. Here we have new discourses made up, or different occasions suggested, by one or other of the two Evangelists, though each is supposed to be drawing from the same source.

The different placing by St. Matthew and St. Luke of incidents, sayings, and discourses, which are complete and substantially the same in each, is the point to which we next turn. This, however, will afford a less satisfactory test. For two different writers might easily differ to some extent as to the best way of combining two series of incidents, etc., from two Sources. Nevertheless the amount of difference of this kind between St. Matthew and St. Luke seems to be greater than would probably thus arise. It is the exception rather than the rule that the same order should be suggested.

Let us briefly compare them with reference to this point. The preaching of the Baptist naturally comes just before the beginning of our Lord's Ministry in both. The place for the narrative of the Temptation, too, was fixed by St. Mark's brief notice, if by no other consideration. Besides these the Healing of the Centurion's Servant follows closely upon the Sermon on the Mount in both Gospels. The question whether the place at which St. Matthew and St. Luke introduce the Sermon on the Mount corresponds to the same or a different point in St. Mark's Outline is a

more difficult one. It seems to be the fashion with recent critics to say that it is the same.¹ But this appears to me to be an error, though I am willing to admit that it is not for our present purpose an important difference. Still it is worth observing that the spread of Christ's fame, which made an occasion for introducing the sermon, is connected by St. Matthew with the extensive preaching in the Synagogues, related by St. Mark in chap. i. 39; whereas St. Luke connects it with a *second* notice of Christ's wide influence in St. Mark, at chap. iii. 7-12, which is also given by St. Matthew in his strictly parallel passage, xii. 15-21. This must, I think, be evident to anyone who will write down in order the headings of the series of narratives in the three Synoptists in parallel columns, leaving spaces where they do not correspond. It is more important to observe that there is a considerable number of sections which St. Matthew places in the central part of the Galilean Ministry, while St. Luke places them in the period of last journeyings towards Jerusalem, each Evangelist often differing also in the circumstances detailed. It is hard to suppose that the arrangement and the introductory notices in the Source would be readily compatible with both of two such opposite modes of treatment as this.

The internal order, however, as we may term it, of the narratives common only to St. Matthew and St. Luke,—that is to say, the relative order among themselves of these narratives in each Gospel—may be reasonably held to be of more importance as an indication of derivation from a common source, than the manner in which the two Evangelists have combined them with other narratives. And it is to be admitted that there is in this respect a good deal of correspondence. Yet there are also several exceptions; and it should at the same time be remembered, that there would

¹ Simons, *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* p. 36. Wendt, *Lehre Jesu*, p. 53. Sanday, *Expositor* for 1891, p. 312.

probably be a good deal of similarity in the order in which incidents would have come to the two Evangelists, by whatever channels they reached them, both because the sequence in which the incidents happened would naturally be preserved in many cases, and from considerations of internal fitness.

To sum up what seems to me to be the result of this first part of the argument. The striking differences in the arrangement by St. Luke of much of the material contained in the chief discourses of St. Matthew's Gospel is highly unfavourable to the idea that they both found this matter in the same document. On the more general questions as to the order of incidents it is less easy to form an opinion; yet on the whole the differences of arrangement seem to be greater than might be expected, if both Evangelists were following the same revered authority.

2. From the general arrangement we turn to the details and verbal form of the material which St. Matthew and St. Luke are supposed both to have derived from the "Logia." We will ask at once, Is St. Matthew or St. Luke faithful to the "Logia," in the position of the second and third *temptations of our Lord in the Wilderness*,¹ *the opening passage of the Sermon on the Mount*,² *the healing of the Centurion's Servant*,³ *the parables of the Great Feast*,⁴ *the Master who left his servants in charge*?⁵ Yet all these are commonly reckoned among the contents of the "Logia."

If these inconsistencies stood alone in the midst of close general similarity, we might imagine that one or other Evangelist had been led to recast what he related owing to information which he had obtained in some other way. They might be paralleled by some, if not such striking,

¹ Matt. iv. 5-11; Luke iv. 9-13.

² Matt. v. 3-12; Luke vi. 20-26.

³ Matt. viii. 5-13; Luke vii. 1-10.

⁴ Matt. xxii. 1-14; Luke xiv. 15-24.

⁵ Matt. xxiv. 14-30; Luke xix. 11-27.

examples of direct inconsistency between the same two Evangelists severally and St. Mark. But at least they militate, so far as they go, against the view that the two Evangelists were using a common source. They make it all the more necessary to measure the amount and the closeness of the similarity in other parts. Are these sufficient to establish or to render probable the supposed use of the "Logia" by both St. Matthew and St. Luke?

Now there is a considerable number of passages in which there is very close, in some cases almost exact, verbal agreement between St. Matthew and St. Luke, and these constitute together an interesting and remarkable phenomenon. Yet they amount in length to somewhat less than a third of the passages which in substance are parallel in St. Matthew and St. Luke, and are not contained in St. Mark. In the remaining two-thirds the degree of verbal agreement is markedly less, and, speaking generally, is not at all close.¹

¹ The following will, I believe, be found a complete, or nearly complete, list of the close parallels, including those which do not extend beyond a single sentence:—

Matt. iii. 7-10, 12.	Luke iii. 7-9, 17.
vi. 24.	xvi. 13.
vi. 25-33.	xii. 22-31.
vii. 3-5.	vi. 41, 42.
vii. 7-11.	xi. 9-13.
viii. 9, 10.	vii. 8, 9.
viii. 19-22.	ix. 57-60.
ix. 37, 38.	x. 2.
xi. 3-11.	vii. 19, 22-28.
xi. 16-19.	vii. 31-35.
xi. 21-27.	x. 12-22.
xii. 25-30.	xi. 17-23.
xii. 38-45.	xi. 29-32, 24-26.
xiii. 33.	xiii. 21.
xxi. 44 (genuineness doubtful).	xx. 18.

I have not included in this list the account of the three temptations in the two Evangelists, not only because of the difference of order but also because the verbal similarity is mainly due to the fact that the temptations and replies are, to a large extent, quotations from the Old Testament. The number of verses in the above table is seventy-nine, each, in St. Matthew and St. Luke. The

Now the passages which are so nearly identical in the two Gospels afford a standard whereby to judge the others. Why should St. Luke, say, if he was using the same document as St. Matthew, have treated it so differently in the two sets of cases?

This diversity becomes more striking when we examine particular instances. Thus in the Sermon on the Mount, as St. Luke gives it, *only two verses* are verbally identical with St. Matthew. In the whole of the rest of the discourse as it is recorded in the third Gospel, though the substance is contained in St. Matthew, there is not a single sentence that is verbally the same, and for the most part there is considerable difference of phraseology. It is a singular circumstance that just those parallels in St. Luke to passages in the Sermon as St. Matthew gives it, in which there is full coincidence, are brought in by him in other contexts. To take another example, there is no close verbal similarity throughout the *Charge to the Twelve* in St. Matthew with the Lucan parallels.

Now Dr. Ewald and Dr. Sanday have noticed the fact that the resemblance between the first and third Gospels in passages which might be supposed to be taken from the "Logia" is very much chosen in some places than in others; ¹ though they do not seem to me to have recognised it adequately. Dr. Sanday, however, is led by it to suggest that while "St. Luke," as well as St. Matthew, "had access to the 'Logia,'" "he also had before him some other document—entirely independent of the "Logia"—which contained a discourse spoken originally on some other occasion, but yet so like the Sermon on the Mount as to be identified

whole number of verses in "the double tradition of St. Matthew and St. Luke," in Mr. Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*, omitting the genealogies and accounts of the infancy and beginning from the Ministry of John, is in St. Matthew 275, in St. Luke 259. That is, the *close* parallels are, as I have said, somewhat less than a third of the whole.

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1891, p. 309.

with it by St. Luke. That Evangelist seems to have given us, not either discourse singly or separately, but the two fused together, the language and expression of the discourse peculiar to himself predominating."¹ First, I would remark that this language does not well correspond to the phenomena of the two Gospels. For surely if either "fuses," it is St. Matthew. And further, if St. Luke, besides having the discourse in his own peculiar source, also knew the source from which St. Matthew takes his, he must, instead of identifying the two, have thought them not the same, and have determined to give some of the portions which were not in his own special source in clearly different connections. It is, however, significant, that one so free from any prejudice against the "two-document hypothesis," as Dr. Sanday has shown himself to be, should be led to adopt such a view. If it is consistently carried out in accordance with the facts to which I have alluded, the consequence must be that the "Logia" must hold quite a subordinate position among St. Luke's authorities. And I think we shall then be driven to ask whether the kind of use of the "Logia" which is thus attributed to him is at all a natural one, or whether some more probable explanation of the close parallels between St. Matthew and St. Luke cannot be found.

3. Thus far in considering the question whether the differences (1) in arrangement and (2) in language and detail in the matter peculiar to St. Matthew and St. Luke are not greater than might be expected if both Evangelists derived it from a common apostolic source, we have confined ourselves to considerations of general probability. But there is a more definite test which we may apply. There is good ground, as I have said, for believing that the second of our Gospels, or a document substantially the same, was used in

¹ EXPOSITOR for April, 1891, p. 315.

the composition of the third, and also in bringing our first to its present shape. We may at all events assume this for the purpose of our present argument, for none of those who hold the theory we are discussing would dispute it. We have, then, in the use which our first and third Evangelists appear to have made of St. Mark, a standard by which to try their use of the "Logia." We know how they treated one document which they followed as an authority, how close they kept to it, what kind of divergences they permitted themselves; we may infer how they would proceed with any other, which occupied an analogous position. This is a line of argument which seems to have received surprisingly little, if any, attention hitherto. And yet, be it observed, they had even more reason to pay reverence to, and to accept the supposed "Logia." For in St. Mark's Gospel they had but the report of the disciple of an eye-witness, while the "Logia," according to the generally accepted view, was the actual work of an Apostle.

(a) Let us first try our proposed standard in regard to the arrangement of common matter. We observe that both St. Matthew and St. Luke have, to speak generally, adhered to the outline of St. Mark throughout. Each makes a few omissions, St. Luke somewhat more than St. Matthew. Each inserts a considerable amount of new matter, but after such insertions each resumes the thread of St. Mark's narrative just where for the moment he had dropped it. The exceptions in St. Matthew are the different positions of (1) the *healing of Peter's wife's mother*,¹ which (if we allow for the space occupied by the insertion of the Sermon on the Mount) will be seen to be not greatly displaced, (2) of the *storm on the lake and the exorcism on its further side*,² which St. Matthew places just before the

¹ Matt. viii. 14-17; Mark i. 29-34.

² Matt. viii. 23-34.

healing of the paralytic,¹ and of the raising of the ruler's daughter,² which he places just after it, whereas St. Luke places this storm and exorcism and raising of Jairus's daughter,³ in immediate succession after the teaching by parables;⁴ (3) the mission of the twelve,⁵ which again St. Matthew brings in at an earlier point than St. Mark does. Perhaps we should add that he combines in one narrative the cursing and withering of the fig-tree,⁶ which in St. Mark are kept separate by the events of twenty-four hours.

The exceptions in St. Luke are (1) the visit to Nazareth,⁷ described by him at the opening of Christ's ministry; though indeed this differs so much in the fulness of its particulars from the visit recorded at a later point by St. Mark (and St. Matthew), that it may have referred to a different occasion, or may at all events have been thought by the Evangelist to do so; (2) the call of the first four disciples,⁸ which St. Mark places before, and St. Luke after, the same brief series of incidents, while the latter connects it with a miracle related only by himself; (3) the charge that Jesus cast out devils by Beelzebub and His answer, which St. Mark connects with the attempt of the relatives of Jesus to seize Him as mad, and places just before the teaching by parables, is by St. Luke placed in the period of the last journeyings towards Jerusalem;⁹ (4) the account of the mother and brethren of Jesus seeking to speak with Him,¹⁰ is placed by St. Luke immediately after instead of immediately before the teaching by parables.

¹ Matt. ix. 1-8.

² Matt. ix. 18-26.

³ Mark iv. 35, v. 43.

⁴ Mark iv. 1-34.

⁵ Matt. x.; Mark vi. 7-13.

⁶ Matt. xxi. 18-22; Mark xi. 12-14, v. 19-25.

⁷ Luke iv. 16-30.

⁸ Luke v. 1-11.

⁹ Mark iii. 22-30; Luke xi. 14-26.

¹⁰ Mark iii. 31-35; Luke viii. 19-21.

These differences of arrangement form the main difficulties that have to be met in connexion with the view that St. Matthew and St. Luke used St. Mark. It would be interesting, if space permitted, to examine these cases in detail. In some the looseness of the formula by which the particular incident is introduced by the Evangelist who diverges from St. Mark prevents an express contradiction. Again, the displacement in some of the instances is but slight, and there are circumstances that help to explain it, as when the introduction of additional matter into St. Mark's outline has made some rearrangement natural. The one serious difference is in the place assigned by St. Matthew to the group of incidents beginning with the storm on the lake. But when the most has been made of all the differences, they afford no parallel to those in the setting of the discourse-material common to St. Matthew and St. Luke alone.

(b) In using the relation of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark as a test in respect to verbal agreement, we must for the purpose of the present argument leave out of account the discourses which St. Mark, as well as the other two, has recorded. For there is a theory that here they were not dependent on him, but that he too was dependent, as they were, on the "Logia." The rest of the matter common to St. Mark with one or both the others consists of description, with brief sayings of our Lord, and answers and questions of His and of His interlocutors imbedded in it. We are to compare the amount of verbal agreement here between the parallels with the verbal agreement in the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke only, which consists mainly of discourse. Now in order that full justice may be done to the force of this comparison, the difference between the character of the subject-matter must be borne in mind. In dealing with mere descriptions of incidents the most truthful historian

may justly feel it right to exercise his own imagination. The details and attendant circumstances of the simplest event are too numerous and complicated for any reporter to record them fully. Fresh narrators, though they were not themselves present, may nevertheless, by employing not only direct information but their general knowledge of human nature and of the time and characters concerned, place the same incidents in a new and more vivid light. But spoken and recorded words are definite facts. Different condensed accounts of what has been spoken may indeed both be true, both being partial. But we are thinking now of the way in which two chroniclers would treat a single written report lying before them, of what they had not themselves heard spoken. It is true that ancient historians were often ready to invent speeches for the actors in the events which they related. But it is another thing to suppose that when they had possession of authentic records of speeches, they would have been disposed freely to alter them. And it is difficult indeed to believe that the Evangelists would have trusted to their own imagination, rather than to evidence, in representing the teaching of the Lord. It is then very striking to observe in passage after passage, that even in description St. Matthew and St. Luke keep much closer to St. Mark than they do to one another in the larger and looser of the two classes of their parallels, the matter contained in which amounts to more than twice that in the other. It seems impossible to suppose that when both were so faithful to one authority even in narrative, one or other of them could have reproduced less faithfully, when it was a question of drawing from a "Collection of the Lord's Discourses" put together by an Apostle.

One or two other points connected with the subject of this paper have yet to be considered, but we must for the present defer the discussion of them. Yet at the stage at

which we have already arrived, we may say that the theory that both St. Matthew and St. Luke used the "Logia" is open to many grave objections, and that it seems at all events impossible to suppose that they both used it to anything like the extent ordinarily assumed.

V. H. STANTON.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

II. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

LIKE most of the great agents of divine providence, Paul had large experience of waiting. He had to wait a considerable time before an opportunity occurred for entering on the mission to the Gentiles to which from the first he had felt himself called. He got the "wink of opportunity" when, according to the narrative in *Acts*, Barnabas went down to Tarsus to seek Saul, and brought him to Antioch, to take part in the movement that had begun there.¹ He had to wait still longer before he could utter his deepest thoughts concerning the Christian faith. The Gentile mission did not of itself bring the fitting occasion, for, as we have seen, he did not judge it needful or desirable to say all that was in his mind to infant Churches, whether of Jewish or of Gentile origin. He gave them the benefit of his Christian intuitions, in which all was involved for himself though not for them, and kept in reserve the deeper ideas of his theology, content to find in these rest for his own heart, conscience, and reason. At length controversy brought the hour for speaking. His success as a Gentile Apostle raised the inevitable question, Must heathen converts submit to Jewish rites in order to obtain the benefits of salvation and of fellowship with Christians of Hebrew extraction? Paul became the earnest champion of Gentile liberties, but, as was to be expected, many took the opposite view; hence came bitter conflict, and the need for unfolding the latent implications of the common faith

¹ *Acts* xi. 25. *Galatians* i. 21-23 shows that Paul had not been altogether idle up till this time. His first mission was in the regions of Syria and Cilicia, and there is no reason to suppose that his efforts were confined to Jews, at least on principle. But those were the days of small things. Weiss thinks that Paul simply passed through Syria and Cilicia on his way home.

in Jesus. Of this conflict, on the issue of which it was to depend whether Christianity was to have a future, the four great Epistles to the Galatian, Corinthian and Roman Churches are the literary monument.

The trouble began at the conference at Jerusalem, when the question was debated: Must Gentile Christians be circumcised? The settlement then arrived at was not radical or final. It seems to have been tacitly assumed that in the case of Jewish Christians circumcision remained as obligatory as ever, and, while it was agreed that the rite was not to be imposed on heathen converts, the delicate question connected with the social relations between the two sections of the Church appears to have been left in a vague indeterminate state. There was room for misunderstandings and the development of opposite tendencies, in the direction either of reducing the agreement to a minimum by attaching disabilities to the position of an uncircumcised Christian, on the one hand, or, on the other hand, of treating the exemption of Gentile converts from subjection to Jewish rites as involving the principle that circumcision was no longer of any religious importance either for Jewish or for Gentile Christians.¹ The collision between Paul and Peter at Antioch revealed the existence of the two tendencies.² The cause of that collision was Peter's refusal, at the instance of men from Jerusalem, to eat with Gentile Christians, after having previously done so without scruple. The position taken up by these men

¹ Holsten too strongly characterises the Jerusalem compact as a separation-union (*Sonderungs-einigung*), based on an inner contradiction of views. Vide *Das Evangelium des Paulus*, p. 21.

² Some writers place this collision between the second and third missionary journeys, during the visit of Paul to Antioch referred to in *Acts* xviii. 22, two or three years after the Jerusalem conference. But if the agreement come to was diversely understood as above indicated, the misunderstanding would not take years to show itself. It would appear on the earliest opportunity. Men like the false brethren referred to in *Galatians* ii. 4 would be on the outlook for a chance of making the compact null and void.

seems to have been : Gentiles may become *Christians* without being circumcised, but they may not eat with us Jews as long as they are uncircumcised ; they must pay the penalty of their freedom by being treated by us as unclean. This was in effect to adhere to the Jerusalem compact in the letter, and to set it aside in the spirit. Paul felt this, and took occasion to state very plainly to his brother Apostle his view of the situation in a speech in which Paulinism was for the first time definitely formulated. The speech was delivered in public, "before all," and produced momentous consequences. The conservatives became a party bitterly opposed to Paul, and bent on counteracting his influence, apparently organising for that purpose a regular anti-Pauline propagandism, following in the Apostle's footsteps wherever he went, not to convert pagans to Christianity, but to pervert converts to their own Judaistic views of the Christian faith.

Though the controversy between Paul and the Judaists originally and immediately referred to the rite of circumcision, it involved wide issues and raised more than one question of grave import. As the conflict went on, three topics assumed in succession the place of greatest prominence : the perpetual obligation of the law, the qualifications for apostleship, and the prerogatives of Israel as an elect people. To set aside circumcision was virtually to annul the whole law, argued Paul's opponents, and Paul admitted the accuracy of their logic, and drew the seemingly impious inference that the Gospel of salvation through faith in Christ involved the entire abrogation of the law as a way to acceptance with God. Thereon the Judaists raised a new question : Who is this man who dares to teach so blasphemous a doctrine against the divinely-given law of Moses ? By what authority does he take it upon him to interpret Christianity in this revolutionary sense ? He calls himself an apostle : what right has he to the

name? He is not one of the twelve who had been with Jesus, and none but they can authoritatively bear witness to or interpret the mind of the Lord, nor can any one be a true teacher, not to say an apostle, whose doctrine is not in accordance with their testimony. It is easy to see how the logic of their position led the Judaists to make such an assault upon Paul's claim to be an apostle, and how Paul in turn could not shirk the question thus raised, but was equally bound by the logic of his position to show that in calling himself the Apostle of the Gentiles he was not guilty of usurpation, though he was neither one of the twelve nor acting under their authority. But that question disposed of, still another remained: On Paul's view of Christianity in relation to the law, what about the election of Israel? She had long been God's chosen people, enjoying valuable privileges—could that be a true conception of Christianity which involved the virtual denial or cancelling of Israel's election? Here again the Apostle of the Gentiles was put upon his defence, and summoned to the solution of a hard problem—the reconciliation of his Gospel with the past history of the Jewish nation.

These three questions respecting the law, the apostolate, and the election, were all essentially involved in the great controversy, and they were probably all from the outset present more or less distinctly to the thoughts of both parties. Yet one may be said to have been more prominent at one time and another at another, so that the three topics may be regarded as denoting distinct stages in the controversy. The three stages are easily recognisable in the relative literature. For while one or other of the four Epistles may contain passages bearing on all the three topics, more or less clearly, yet they may be classified according as this or that topic is the one chiefly discussed. The Epistle to the Galatians is occupied predominantly with the first of the three themes, the two Epistles to the

Corinthians (to be regarded in this connection as one) with the second, and the Epistle to the Romans, in the matter peculiar to it, with the third. In *Galatians* Paul defends the independence of Christianity against those who would make Christendom subject to Jewish law and custom; in 1 and 2 *Corinthians* he defends his own independence and authority as a God-commissioned Apostle of the Gentiles against those who asserted the exclusive authority of the eleven; in *Romans*, while giving a comprehensive statement of his views on the Gospel, he addresses himself very specially to the solution of the problem how to reconcile his idea of Christianity with the admitted truth that Israel had for many centuries been God's elect people.

In all our references to the four Epistles, it has been assumed that their proper order is that in which they have been named in the foregoing paragraph. That they were actually written in this order is the opinion of the majority of commentators. Some English scholars, however, favour a different order, placing the Epistles to the Corinthians first, and *Galatians* between them and *Romans*. In his valuable commentary on *Galatians*, Bishop Lightfoot has carefully discussed the question, and given weighty reasons in support of this arrangement.¹ His two main arguments are based on the great similarity in thought and expression between *Galatians* and *Romans*, and on the manner in which the Apostle speaks in these two Epistles and 2 *Corinthians* respectively concerning his tribulations; with copious details in the last-mentioned Epistle, with one pointed reference in *Galatians*,² very mildly and but seldom in *Romans*. In both cases the facts are as stated; the only point open to dispute is whether the inference be irresistible. The similarity between *Galatians* and *Romans* is explained by the supposition that the latter Epistle was

¹ *Vide* the Introduction, pp. 36-56.

² *Galatians* vi. 17.

written shortly after the former, while the echoes of its utterances still lingered in the writer's mind. But this is not the only possible explanation of the phenomenon. It may be accounted for by the hypothesis that the Apostle in both Epistles was drawing upon a stock of Christian thought which in its essential positions, in the arguments on which these rested, and even in verbal expression, was to a large extent stereotyped, and thoroughly familiar to himself, though new to his readers. In that case letters touching on the same topics, no matter what interval of time separated them, would exhibit such resemblances as have been shown to exist in the two Epistles in question. The other set of facts also admits of another explanation besides that given by Bishop Lightfoot. His theory is that the Epistle which says most about apostolic tribulations must have been nearest them in the date of its composition. But the truth is that the prominence given to that topic in *2 Corinthians* is not due to the recentness of the experiences but to their appositeness to the purpose on hand. As will hereafter appear, the trials he endured formed an important part of Paul's argument in support of his apostleship.

I adhere therefore to the order previously indicated, which, apart from all historical questions as to dates of composition, best suits the logic of the controversy, and proceed to take a rapid survey of *the Epistle to the Galatians*.

The very first sentence shows that something has occurred to disturb the spirit of the writer. In his letters to the Thessalonians Paul gives himself no title; here, on the other hand, he not only calls himself an Apostle, but takes pains to indicate that for his apostolic standing he is indebted neither primarily nor subordinately to any man or body of men, but to God alone.¹ The same thing may be

¹ οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου; not from men (e.g. the eleven), as ultimate source, nor by any man as instrument.

said of every true apostle and prophet, but why so peremptory an assertion of independence? Because there are those who assail his independence, and desire to make out that he is either no apostle at all, or one subordinate to the eleven, and therefore bound to conform in opinion and action to their authority; and all this in order to undermine his influence as a teacher of views which the assailants regard with aversion. Fully aware how closely belief in his authority as a teacher is connected with continued adherence to his doctrine, the Apostle commences with this topic, and sets himself in a very thorough earnest way to demonstrate the originality of his Gospel, and his entire freedom as the Apostle of the Gentiles from all dependence on the other Apostles. This, however, is not the leading aim of the Epistle, though it forms the topic of the first two chapters. The main purpose is revealed in the sentence following the salutation and doxology, in which the Apostle suddenly and indignantly exclaims: "I am surprised that ye have so soon turned away from him who called you in the grace of Christ unto another Gospel."¹ The unhappy change alluded to is from a Gospel of salvation by grace to a gospel of salvation by circumcision, and the leading aim of the Apostle is to check the perverse movement, and to bring back the Galatians to their first faith. The section bearing on the apostleship from chap. i. 11 to the end of chap. ii. may be viewed as a long parenthesis, after which the main theme is resumed, and the Galatians are again directly addressed and remonstrated with for allowing themselves to be led away.

This section, though parenthetical, is very important in its bearing on the main design of the Epistle. It consists

¹ *Gal.* i. 6. The expression οὕτως ταχέως is founded on by most interpreters as proving that *Galatians* must have been written before 1 and 2 *Corinthians*, shortly after Paul's second visit to Galatia, at the beginning of his three years' residence in Ephesus.

of three parts, of which the first is intended to show that Paul was not indebted to the other apostles for his knowledge of Christ and of the Gospel (i. 11-24); the second, that he was in no wise controlled by them in regard to his preaching of the Gospel (ii. 1-10); the third, that so far from any of the apostles prescribing to him what he should preach, the fact was that he, on the contrary, had occasion to remonstrate with one of the pillar-apostles, Peter, in regard to unstable, inconsistent conduct fitted to compromise the great principles of the Gospel (ii. 11-21). What he says on the first head amounts to this, that he had neither the inclination nor the opportunity to learn much about Christianity from the apostles. In the second part, he gives an extremely interesting account of important occurrences in connection with the Jerusalem conference, which unfortunately has given rise to much diversity of opinion among critics and interpreters. But amid much that is doubtful one thing is clear. The Apostle most distinctly states that the pillar-apostles with whom he held conference, "added nothing" to him,¹ that is, gave him no additional instructions as to what he should preach, found no fault with his Gospel as frankly explained to them, were content that he should continue preaching as he had preached. They reverently recognised the hand of God in the whole career of this man: in his conversion, in his conception of the nature and destination of Christianity, in his success as a missionary to the Gentiles. They acquiesced in his Gospel of uncircumcision as at least suitable for heathen converts, and wished him all success in preaching it in heathen parts, while they confined their own ministry to the Jewish world, being humbly

¹ *Gal. ii. 6.* οὐδὲν προσανέθεντο. The verb in classic Greek means to lay on an additional burden. In later Greek it means to impart to, either to give or to get advice, instruction, or injunction. Here it means that the apostles gave no additional instructions. In chapter i. 16 the same word is employed in the other sense: οὐ προσανεθέμην, "I did not consult in order to get advice."

conscious of unfitness for work in any other sphere. Such being the attitude of the eleven, their authority could not truthfully be appealed to in support of a reactionary movement which strove to reduce the Jerusalem compact to a minimum, or even to make it a nullity by endeavouring to induce Gentile Christians to submit to circumcision, as the Judaist sectaries seem to have done in Galatia.

The third division of the long parenthesis respecting the apostleship is the most important of all. It exhibits Paul as teaching one of the pillar-apostles, instead of being taught by them, the true nature of the Gospel; yet not teaching a new gospel, as if Paul's Gospel were different from that of the other apostles, but rather showing to Peter the true import of his own Gospel; the scope, tendency, and logical consequence of his own professed principles. The doctrinal statement it contains is an epitome of Paulinism, given in a few rapid, impassioned sentences, charged at once with the thorough-going logic of a powerful intellect, and the intense emotion of a great manly heart. There is nothing more stirring in the whole range of the Pauline literature, nothing more convincing, than this swift, eloquent sketch of the gospel of uncircumcision, brought in incidentally, in the course of a historical narrative intended to vindicate the Apostle's independence, but serving a far higher purpose also, viz. to vindicate the independence of the Gospel itself as a Gospel of free grace, meant for the salvation of all sinners alike, and able to save all in the most efficient manner without the aid of legal ordinances. As against Peter the memorable utterance makes good three serious charges: that he has been guilty (1) of virtually excommunicating the Gentile Christians by insisting on their complying with Jewish custom as a condition of fellowship,¹ (2) of self-stultification in building again the things he had

¹ Gal. ii. 14: πῶς τὰ ἔθνη ἀναγκάζεις Ἰουδαίειν. The compulsion lay in Peter's example.

destroyed, (3) of frustrating the grace of God by in effect declaring that it is insufficient for man's salvation, and needs to be supplemented by legal performances. Viewed not polemically but didactically, it briefly indicates all the leading ideas of the Pauline theology in much the same order as in the Epistle to the Romans. Jews by birth and Gentile "sinners" on a level, as unable to save themselves by their works, Jews being sinners not less than Gentiles, though proudly applying the epithet to the latter as if it had no reference to themselves; faith the sole way to justification for both, faith in Jesus Christ crucified; justification by faith and justification by the law mutually exclusive; by faith, therefore, the law abolished, so that the believer in Jesus is no longer bound by it; finally, the Christian life a life of mystic union and communion with Christ, and of devoted love to Christ in response to the love wherewith He loved us, in giving Himself to death for our salvation. It is obviously not solely for historic reasons that the Apostle repeats here this remarkable confession of his faith. He has in view the present instruction of the Church to which he writes, and means, though he does not put it down on paper, "this is what I said to Peter then, and this I say to you now."

We come now to the main part of the Epistle (chaps. iii.-v.). The contents of this part may be summed up by three phrases: 1. *Legalism condemned*, chap. iii.; 2. *Christian liberty asserted*, chaps. iv.-v. 1-6; 3. *Abuse of liberty censured*, chap. v. 13-26.

1. Full of enthusiasm for the creed which he has just expounded, the Apostle passes on to its defence with a natural feeling of surprise and vexation that so unwelcome a duty should be necessary. He cannot understand how a Church to which a crucified Christ had been broadly proclaimed¹ should lapse into legalism. A crucified Christ

¹ Gal. iii. 1, *προεγράφη*, well rendered by Lightfoot "placarded."

meant everything to him, why should He not be everything to them? Who could have bewitched them, for it seemed as if the result could be accounted for only by the fascinating spell of some malign power? Alas the unhappy change is not so difficult to understand as Paul seems to have imagined. There is nothing so natural as this lapse in the case of the average Christian, nothing so common; Christian life habitually maintained up in the pure Alpine region of the Pauline faith is the exception rather than the rule. For few are so consistent in their logic as Paul, so thorough in the application of first principles, so possessed by the love of Christ, and therefore so jealous of every other servitude. Paul's doctrine is, after all, a heroic doctrine, and it needs spiritual heroes to appreciate it and do it justice. Besides, it has to be remembered that while Paul had his experience of legalism before his conversion, for most men it comes after. Few escape taking the spiritual disease at some time or other.

The Galatian Church caught the evil infection from the Judaist propagandists, and so Paul must argue the matter with them. The heads of his argument lie before us. How it told on the first readers we do not know; to ourselves it may appear of varying value, and occasionally such as to remind us that Paul was once a disciple of the Rabbis. The first proof is not the least convincing, being a direct appeal to experience. How, asks the Apostle, did ye receive the Spirit who wrought in you and through you so mightily; by doing legal works, or by believing the good tidings ye heard from my lips? And if in this way your Christian life began, why forsake it now? If faith was so powerful at first, why should it not be equally powerful all through? Listen not to the men who would enslave you to the law; listen rather to God, who gave you His spirit and wrought miracles among you, before ever you heard a word of circumcision or the Jewish law, thereby show-

ing that these things are no wise necessary or conducive to salvation.

To be noted in this first line of reasoning is the pointed way in which law is opposed to faith, and flesh to spirit. "Received ye the spirit from the works of the law, or from the hearing of faith?" "Having begun in the spirit, are ye now being perfected in the flesh?" We have here two of the great Pauline antitheses.

The Apostle's next appeal is to the history of Abraham,¹ obviously an important topic in an argument with men enamoured of Judaism. If he could make it appear that history was on his side, a great point would be gained. To what extent is he successful? To this extent, at least, that in the patriarch's history acceptableness to God is associated with faith, and the promise embraces in its scope the Gentiles. The story makes the broad impression that men please God not by doing this or that, but by believing in Him, and that whoever believes in God, whether Jew or Gentile, may hope to share in His grace. This length a modern student of Scripture may go, without pretending to find Paul's doctrine of justification by faith, in the technical theological sense, in the book of Genesis.

The next point the Apostle makes is this: while by faith you share the blessing of Abraham, what you get from the law is not blessing but *cursing*.² Is it not written, "Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them"? The most notable thing in this section of the argument is the saying concerning the function of Christ in relation to the law's curse. *Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us*; the proof that He was made a curse being that He suffered death in the form of crucifixion.³ This is doubtless one of the great Pauline *logia*;

¹ iii. 6-9.

² iii. 10-14.

³ iii. 13.

a new utterance but an old thought, dating even in its expression from early years. It is more than the simple statement of a religious faith; it contains the germ of a theological theory; for latent in it is the principle that the Redeemer of men must share their lot in order that they may share His privilege, a principle of which we shall find other exemplifications in Paul's Epistles.

The Apostle proceeds to base an argument on the mere date of the Sinaitic legislation.¹ Given above four hundred years after the promise, and of course not for the purpose of setting it aside, the law must have been intended to perform some function in subordination to the promise. This at once raises the question, what was that function? "What then the law?"² Paul's full answer to the question is not given here; we must wait for it till we come to his Epistle to the Romans. What he does say in the present Epistle is a little obscure, owing to the rapid movement of his thought, which rushes on like a mountain torrent. Had we no other information as to his doctrine concerning the law, we might readily take his meaning to be that it was added to *restrain* transgression. It would be nearer the truth to say that he means to suggest that the law was given *in favour* of transgression,³ to provoke resistance to its behests. This is certainly a very bold idea, but it is none the less likely to be Pauline. The Apostle's whole doctrine of the law is one of the most startlingly original features in his apologetic system of thought, which we might be tempted to regard as an extravagance into which he was driven by the exigencies of controversy. This, however, would be a very mistaken idea. It is, we may be sure, no hastily extemporized theory, but the carefully thought out solution of a problem which pressed

¹ iii. 15-18.

² iii. 19.

³ So Lipsius, *Die Paulinische Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 75 (1853), Menegoz and many others.

heavily on Paul's mind, from the day he arrived at the conclusion that the law, whatever it might be good for, was certainly not the way to the attainment of righteousness.

While failing to give a full statement of the solution in this Epistle the Apostle makes some very instructive suggestions respecting the law's function. For this purpose he employs three comparisons, likening the law first to a gaoler who, after provoking men to transgression, throws them into prison, and keeps them there under lock and key;¹ next to a *pædagogus*, entrusted with the moral supervision of a child;² lastly, to the guardians and stewards who have charge of the person and property of the heir to an estate during the time of his minority.³ All three comparisons have one general object in view, to show how the law might have a real function, yet only a *temporary* one issuing in release from its power. The gaoler's function is real and necessary, but the time comes when the prisoner must be set free. The *pædagogus* in a Greek or Roman family served a useful if humble purpose in the moral nurture of a child of tender years, but in due course the child outgrew his influence. The care of guardians and stewards is most necessary to the well-being of an heir and the preservation of his inheritance, but it ceases, as matter of course, when he comes of age. The figures all serve further to convey a hint as to the comparatively ungenial nature of the law's function; to exhibit it as such, that the subject of it will be glad to escape from it when the time of release arrives. It appears at its worst under the figure of a gaoler; less repulsive under the guise of the *pædagogus*, because the subject is now conceived not as a criminal but as a child, though even his mode of treatment is harsh compared with

¹ iii. 23.

² iii. 24. *παιδαγωγός* is untranslatable because the function is unknown among us.

³ iv. 2. *ἐπιτρόπους*, having charge of the person; *οἰκονόμους*, having charge of the property.

that of a parent;¹ least irksome under the final figure, for now the child is grown to be a youth, and the guardians and stewards do not forget what he will be ere long, yet becoming increasingly unwelcome as the future heir advances towards maturity, and longs with growing eagerness for escape from authority into self-control. Under all three aspects, even the mildest, the reign of law is bearable only for a time, creating in the subject an irrepressible desire for *liberty*.

2. Liberty came with Jesus Christ. Of this congenial theme Paul goes on to speak. He introduces the subject in connection with the last of the above-mentioned comparisons, which he regards as the most important of the three, as appears from the formal manner in which he brings it in: "Now I say," etc.² He has hinted already at the truth that with Christ the era of liberty or true sonship began,³ but he is able now to make a more adequate statement of the fact, in connection with the figure of the heir in a state of pupillage, which gives it an effective setting, *and brings out the epoch-making significance of the advent of Jesus in the general religious history of the world*. In terms of that figure he represents the advent as marking the point at which mankind, the son of God, arrived at its majority. Then commenced the era of grace, of liberty, of sonship, of the new humanity in which is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, but all are one in Christ.⁴ It is a truly magnificent thought, one of the greatest in the whole range of Paulinism. And one cannot

¹ This is the point emphasised by Lipsius, *Die Paul. Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 80. The *pædagogus* acts with rigour, not with love. On the other hand, Menegoz thinks that the temporariness of the office is the one thing to be insisted on, *Le Péché et la Rédemption*, p. 115. But there is a reference to both aspects.

² *Gal. iv. 1*: λέγω δὲ.

³ *iii. 26*.

⁴ *iii. 28*.

but feel with what powerful effect Christ's agency in bringing about the great change is spoken of in association with this grand philosophic idea. "But when the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that He might redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons."¹ Here is another great Pauline *logion*, a fresh contribution to the theology of the cross, applying the principle of solidarity between Redeemer and redeemed in a new direction. The subjects of redemption being under law, the Redeemer also came under law, that by this act of grace He might put an end for ever to the state of legal bondage. It is noteworthy that the Apostle refers not only to Christ's subjection to law, but to his birth. Why is this? Perhaps we should avoid too recondite explanations, and adopt the simple suggestion that the form of subjection to law which he has in his mind is *circumcision*, the bone of contention between himself and the Judaist. In that case his thought may be thus paraphrased: Jesus came to be born of woman, and then, being a Jew, to be circumcised, and so to deliver us from bondage to that rite and all that goes along with it. Thus viewed, this great text ascribes redemptive power, not merely to Christ's death, but to His whole state of gracious humiliation.

The objective ideal significance of Christ's coming being that it inaugurated the new era of filial freedom—prison doors opened, children grown to manhood, the heir no longer a minor, it is easy to see what duty is incumbent on the Christian. It is to understand the nature of the new era in which he lives, to enter sympathetically into its spirit, and subjectively to realise its lofty ideal. Obligation lies on him to be free indeed, as a son of God arrived at his majority. That accordingly is what the Apostle next pro-

¹ Gal. iv. 4, 5. The idea of adoption will come up for discussion at a later stage.

ceeds to insist on. Appealing once more to the experience of his readers in confirmation of the view of Christianity he has just presented, "Did you not," he asks in effect, "find something in your own hearts which told you that Jesus came to introduce the era of sonship? Was there not a spirit in you which made you call God Father? It was God sending the spirit of His own well-beloved Son into your breasts, that you might be sons in feeling as well as in legal standing. Be faithful then to that spirit whose promptings ye once obeyed. Return not again to bondage, to the weak and beggarly elements, whether of Jewish legalism or of Pagan superstition, from which it was the very purpose of Christ's coming to redeem you."¹ Such is the drift of chapter iv. 6-20, omitting points of minor importance.

With this pathetic appeal the Apostle might well have concluded his argument. But his active mind is full of ideas, and he has yet another train of thought in reserve by which he hopes to commend his doctrine of Christian freedom from the law to the acceptance of his readers. Abraham having done service in establishing the doctrine, his family is now made to perform its part by the allegory of Sarah and Hagar and their sons.² Here again the Christian Apostle and Prophet may appear to be clad in the robe of a Rabbi, but let not that be to his prejudice. Take the allegory for what it is worth; as poetry rather than logic, meant not so much to convince the reason as to captivate the imagination. If it served that purpose at a great crisis in the world's religious history, was it not worth while, even if it should be of little value to us? At the very least, it

¹ The words are generally interpreted as having this double reference. *Στοιχῆια* means literally the letters of the alphabet ranged in rows, and the idea suggested is that the Jewish and pagan religions were fit only for the childhood of the world, when men were, as it were, only learning their letters.

² Chap. iv. 21-31. *Vide* on this Prof. Findlay's most felicitous commentary on the Epistle (*Expositor's Bible*). He hits off the spirit of the passage by the remark: "He will tell his 'children' a story."

has autobiographical interest, for the prose poem bears a date upon it. It comes to us from the period of the retirement in Arabia, and we scent the keen air of the desert as we read it. Let us read and silently enjoy, abstaining from the stupidity of a prosaic detailed interpretation.

One can understand the passionate earnestness with which this man of prophetic, poetic soul, true son of the Jerusalem above, once more appeals to the Galatians to stand fast in their Christ-bought liberty, and not to become reentangled in a yoke of bondage, and warns them that that must be the inevitable effect of their submitting to the rite of circumcision.¹ And how welcome, after the subtle argumentation of the previous chapter, the brief sententious statement of the healthy normal Christian attitude on all such questions as were in debate. "*We (Christians who know where they are) in the Spirit from faith wait for the hope of righteousness. For in Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith energetic through love.*" This is another of the great Pauline words, having for its import: circumcision *et hoc genus omne*, good for nothing, faith good for everything; good to begin with, and not less good to end with; good to sanctify as well as to justify, because it is a powerful practical force operating through the highest motive, love.²

3. On the Apostle's warning against the abuse of liberty (chap. v. 13-26) little need be said, beyond remarking that on this score he exhibits here, as always, a most becoming sensitiveness. He traces the source of abuse to the *flesh* and finds the antidote in walking by the Spirit.³ He makes no attempt here, as in *Romans*, to show how moral license is excluded by a right view of the relation subsisting between the Christian and Christ, but he compensates for that

¹ Chap. v. 1-4.

² More will be said on this text in a future paper.

³ Chap. v. 16.

lack by drawing up two lists of the works of the flesh and of the Spirit respectively, that the one may repel by its hideousness, and the other draw by its winsomeness. How strange that the facts of human life should supply material for so tremendous a contrast! Stranger still that it should be possible to find materials for the contrast within the religious world! For the fruit of the Spirit: love, joy, peace, etc., is set over against the spiritual vices connected with the "carnality of religious contention," not less than against the coarser vices of the irreligious sensualist. It is easy to be a religious partisan, regeneration is not necessary for that; the difficulty is to be a true Christian.

The postscript ¹ must not be passed over in silence. After the speech to Peter, it is the most characteristic thing in the Epistle. The letter has been written at white heat, dictated more rapidly than the *amanuensis* can write it down. Paul reads it over, finds he has still something to say, writes it down himself, in large, bold, inelegant characters, unmistakable by any one who has seen his handwriting before. The sentiments are as unmistakably Pauline as the penmanship. Here is no elaborate reasoning, whether of the ex-Rabbi or of the theological doctor, but abrupt, impassioned, prophetic utterances of deepest convictions: the zealots for Judaism, hollow hypocrites; the cross of Christ the sole worthy ground of glorying; circumcision nothing, the new Christian creation in the individual and in the community everything; the men who adopt this for their motto, the true Israel of God, on whom may God's peace ever rest.

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ Chap. vi. 11-17.

ABOUT THE SIXTH HOUR.

IT is always regrettable when a controversy between two scholars ends in an irreconcilable difference about a matter of fact—as to matters of opinion people will always differ—and that seems to be the case in the controversy between Dr. Sanday and Dr. Dodds in *THE EXPOSITOR*, IV., pp. 238, 396. As some interesting problems of biblical antiquities are connected with the point in dispute, it may be useful to attempt to determine what are the facts; and this attempt is all the more required because of the very inaccurate account of the reckoning of hours in the day given in most handbooks; see *e.g.* the latest edition of Smith's *Dictionary of Antiquities*, in the article "Hora."

In much that has been written on the subject, obscurity and even error have been caused by confusion between the two senses of the word *day*:¹ (1) What the Romans called the civil Day, including a day and a night; (2) the natural day as distinguished from the night, viz., the period that extends between sunrise and sunset. We shall distinguish the two senses of the word by using the capital letter for the civil Day.

In the first century of our era, the day was divided, in popular language, into 12 equal parts or hours, which varied in length according to the season, being about 75 minutes long in midsummer, 60 minutes long at the equinoxes, and 45 minutes long in midwinter. The time of day was expressed by mentioning the nearest complete hour; and only in rare and exceptional cases do we find any attempt to indicate time more precisely. The expression,

¹ Bilfinger, who has done so much to clear up the subject, has fallen a victim to this confusion; and has used facts concerning the one day as evidence about the other kind of day.

“the first hour,” indicated the time when the shadow on the dial reached the mark which showed that one-twelfth of the day had elapsed; and the expression, “the sixth hour,” indicated the time when the shadow on the dial reached the mark which showed that six-twelfths of the day had elapsed. The “sixth hour,” then, indicated mid-day at all seasons of the year. This point is most important, and is misstated in almost every handbook (*e.g.*, in a newly published Latin grammar, which reached me as I am writing). The hours were indicated to the eye on the sun-dial, and also to the ear by various devices, as, for example, in Trimalchio’s house by a trumpeter; and common language adapted itself to these well-marked periods. Even in countries where few dials or other devices for measuring time existed, usage followed the established custom. Similarly, at the present day, in some remote Turkish village where not a single clock or watch exists, all the people reckon by hours of the clock; but the reckoning is very rough, and the ancient popular reckoning was also very rough. Mid-day was the best marked period, when the sun is in mid-heaven; and “the sixth hour” in common usage indicated in a vague way the time when the sun is near the zenith. Still more elastic, of course, was the expression, “about the sixth hour,” which, except where the circumstances of the speaker imply better opportunity for precise reckoning, cannot be interpreted more accurately than somewhere between 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. In this rough, popular language, little attempt was made to reckon any other hour except “the third” and “the ninth hour,” which meant a time when the sun was fairly well up in the heavens. This may seem to us intolerably loose; but it serves very well in practice in a country where there are no trains to catch.¹ To the Oriental mind, the question between the third hour and the

¹ Even where there are trains in Turkey, the ordinary native comes at sunrise to the station, and waits patiently till the train is ready, perhaps at noon.

sixth is not more important than the doubt between 12.5 and 12.10 p.m. is to us.

A discrepancy between two witnesses, one of whom declares that an event occurred at the sixth hour (when the sun was in mid-heaven), while the other asserts that it took place at the third hour (when the sun was half-way up), may be illustrated by a doubt that sometimes occurs in Ogham inscriptions. A line perpendicular to the central dividing line means I, while one inclined about 45° means R; but what is to be made of one which, through careless engraving, is inclined about 75° ? Opinions will differ, and some distinguished scholars will be found to assert positively that the stone reads I, while others will assert equally positively that it reads R. So it was formerly with the hours in ancient times: ordinary people had not the means of distinguishing accurately, and differed in opinion accordingly. Godet's remark that the Apostles had no watches has been called flippant; but it touches the critical point. The Apostles had no means of avoiding the difficulty as to whether it was the third or the sixth hour when the sun was near mid-heaven, and they cared very little about the point.

In the highly organised life of Rome and a few other great cities there was more accurate reckoning; but their reckoning was by hours, where we reckon by minutes. No one ever thought of, or had any term to express, minuter divisions of time than the hour; and, in Latin idiom, "in the lapse of an hour" (*horæ momento*) is used where we should now say "in a second." But the highly civilized inhabitant of Rome was as much superior in accuracy to the ruder peoples as a modern business man is to an ancient Roman, or an astronomer to a business man.

The night was, in popular language, not divided into hours, but into watches: some rare examples of the use of hours of the night may be neglected. The division of the

day into hours sprang from the use of the sun-dial, and its peculiar character, *i.e.*, the varying length of the hours, was conditioned by its origin: hours of the night could be measured only by water-glass, or some similar means, which would give divisions of equal length during all seasons of the year, and not varying hours like those of the day.

The civil Day was not divided into hours; it was a purely religious, legal, and scientific entity, and did not affect in any way popular division of time. Among the Greeks and the Jews it began at sunset; among the Romans it began at midnight. The fact that the Christian Day began at sunset is significant as to the Eastern, and not Roman, origin of all those forms into which the idea enters. There was no device practised by the ancients for dividing the civil Day into parts; and such a division could never in any way come to affect ordinary thought or habits. Where water-glasses (*clepsydræ*), which indicated hours of unvarying length, were employed to measure hours of the natural day, some device was applied in order to make them show hours of varying length at different seasons of the year.

Such expressions as "the first hour," "the sixth hour," have then only one meaning. An overwhelming mass of authority proves this usage; any exception to it must be established on its own merits. But the usage was not specially Roman. It was learned by the Romans from the Greeks, along with the sun-dial, the water-glass, and other scientific instruments. Dr. Sanday therefore was right in criticising Dr. Dods's use of the term, "the Roman reckoning" to indicate this usage of speech; and Dr. Dods could only defend it as a rough way of expressing the fact that this usage was practically universal in the Græco-Roman world. But we cannot allow that Dr. Sanday is right in saying "the Romans had two methods of reckoning the

hours of the day"; he was more careful at first, when he said, "the evidence perhaps does not permit us to say the *hours*, but the *day*"; but even this is not quite right. He should say, "the Romans used the term day in two different senses, but reckoned the hours only by one day."

This supposed second method of reckoning the hours is a mere fiction, constructed as a refuge of despairing harmonisers,¹ and not a jot of evidence for it has ever been given that will bear scrutiny. The stock example is that of Polycarp's death at the eighth hour: it is argued that martyrdoms regularly took place before noon, and that the time must in this case be stated according to a reckoning from midnight.² I quite admit that, in ordinary practice, executions took place in the forenoon; but this arose merely from the fact that the early morning hours were the time for work, and that the fifth hour, or at latest noon, brought the day's business to an end, so far as judicial and legal duties and all that arose out of them were concerned.³ But there sometimes occurred cases in which circumstances caused the execution to linger on until the afternoon, and Polycarp's trial is one of these cases. Several excellent authorities have declared that the hour of Polycarp's death may quite fairly be taken as "the eighth hour" in the ordinary sense, about 2 p.m.; but I do not know that the case has ever been quite rightly put: the tale shows clearly that Polycarp died after noon.

¹ Dr. Sanday, much as he would evidently like it, rightly accepts the conclusion that there is not evidence to justify it. It is of course impossible and unnecessary to prove that a second method of reckoning did not exist. It can only be shown that no evidence for it exists, and that it is not consistent with the method of reckoning and thinking customary among the ancients.

² In discussing this question I have in view particularly the paper of Rev. J. A. Cross on the subject, and the questions which he proposes as needing solution, as to the hour of executions, etc. See *Classical Review*, June, 1891.

³ This statement is made especially about the Greek provinces, but it is not very inaccurate even if applied to Rome under the Empire.

At a first glance it certainly seems as if Polycarp, having been arrested the previous evening and conducted to Smyrna, was tried before the pro-consul sitting in the stadium in the morning and executed immediately afterwards, owing to the hurry of the people. Thus his execution would take place about 8 or 9 a.m. But on closer inspection we see that, when Polycarp was tried, the sports were already over,¹ and the president declared it was not legal for him to reopen them and give Polycarp to the beasts.² We can hardly suppose that the sports concluded much before mid-day, and the recorded facts afford a perhaps unique piece of evidence as to the Asian custom in these shows.

Polycarp perished at the eighth hour, two hours after midday. The events leading up to his death, though performed with great rapidity (as is expressly mentioned) must have taken some little time. Suitable wood had to be found and brought to the stadium. There were eager agents to run and fetch it; yet it needed some time for them to leave their places in the vast auditorium, to go out and get the wood, to bring it back, to pile the pyre, to fix the upright stake, to bind Polycarp to it after discussing whether or not they should, according to the usual custom, nail him to it, and to light the wood. The fire did not easily reach the martyr, being blown by the wind; and thus some time elapsed before his death took place. For the trial itself some time must be allowed; the regular forms of procedure must have been gone through by a punctilious

¹ We can naturally understand that the sports would not be interrupted in order to permit the trial to take place. We note also that the search for Polycarp was made in accordance with the shouts of the crowd at the close of the *venatio* on the Friday.

² I used formerly to understand the president to mean that the sports finished on the preceding day; but this is not correct. The people's demand for the beasts implies that the beasts had been shown immediately before and were still at hand.

Roman official, although, as usual, many of them are omitted in the narrative ; they began from the constituting of the court, and the formal identification of the prisoner, and finished with the formal writing out of the sentence, which was then read by the proconsul himself. I quite allow that the impatience of the crowd hurried the procedure ; but Roman officials were methodical, and the proconsul was personally inclined to postpone the decision, and to hear the prisoner defend his views at length. It is clear then that Polycarp was not introduced until the sports were over for the day ; and, as the whole scene must have taken between two and three hours, we may fairly suppose that the fifth hour was the conclusion of the sports.

Scrutinizing the narrative of Polycarp's arrest, we notice that he was arrested near sunset on the Friday ; and that the place was a villa at some distance from the city (whither Polycarp had gone from the villa near the city to which he first retired). He was allowed to pray for two hours. After this, "when the hour for departure arrived," he was conducted to Smyrna on the Saturday. The hour for departure is distinguished from the end of the prayer ; and it is clear that the departure was postponed till next morning. It would take place at a very early hour on Saturday ; but we see that, owing to the distance, he did not reach Smyrna till the games had begun. When they were over, Polycarp was brought before the proconsul ; and the whole crowd waited to hear the result. The trial thus began somewhere about half an hour before noon.

Incidentally, this explanation furnishes also the explanation of what has always seemed to me the great difficulty in accepting the narrative as minutely correct. How could Jews on a Sabbath, and a Sabbath of unusual sanctity, be present at games in the stadium ? I have consulted many authorities on this point, without finding any satisfactory explanation ; yet the conviction always remained in my

mind that the explanation would be found hereafter. It is that the Jews were not present at the games, but came to the trial; and learning the situation from the eager ministers who rushed to the baths and the shops to fetch fuel, they joined in the execution, which was perfectly lawful for them.

May we not infer from this that the fifth hour was ordinarily the end of such sports on the Ionian coast? The idea is widespread that the sports lasted through the whole day; but, in a luxurious and rather lazy country, it is not probable that they made a toil of a pleasure; and those who try it will find that, when (as was then usual) the day's duties begin before sunrise, no pleasure is to be obtained by prolonging exhibitions even in February at Smyrna beyond noon at latest.

Further, when we remember that in Acts xix., according to *Codex Bezae*, Paul preached in the school of Tyrannus at Ephesus from the fifth to the tenth hour, may we not connect this with the fact that ordinary duties ceased an hour before noon, and that the school then became vacant, and Paul could use it during the hours which were ordinarily devoted to rest?

Pionius died at Smyrna at the tenth hour. We may explain the lateness of the hour by supposing, (1) that his trial was not first on the list for the day; (2) that it took a considerable time, being protracted by the torture inflicted on him; (3) that the preparations for burning him took longer time than in the case of Polycarp; (4) that he had to be conducted from the court to the place of execution.

In the case of martyrdom by wild beasts in the sports, it is obvious from the preceding remarks that they occurred in the early hours of the day.

W. M. RAMSAY.

THE DIFFICULT WORDS OF CHRIST.

2. *HOLY VIOLENCE.*

MATT. XI. 12.¹

FEW things in the Gospels are more beautiful than the relations to one another of Jesus and the Baptist. John's trial came when the popularity of Jesus began to eclipse his own. Busybodies were not awanting to kindle in his heart feelings of jealousy by pointing out that the crowds that formerly thronged to him had gone away to Jesus. But he put these suggestions aside and rose nobly above his temptation. He told his unwise friends that a man can receive nothing except it be given him from above. He had had his own day and his own share, and now Jesus had received His; and, if the success of Jesus was greater than his own, he could rejoice in it, as the friend of the bridegroom does on the wedding-day, when the bridegroom carries off the prize of love and beauty: "He must increase, but I must decrease." The trial of Jesus came when John sent from his prison to ask, "Art thou He that should come, or look we for another?" In this question there was a tone of disappointment and depreciation, which was fitted to have a prejudicial influence on the fortunes of Jesus; for, if John doubted, might not all be excused for hesitating? Jesus felt the blow; but, as soon as the messengers of John were departed, He rallied from it; His mind was invaded with an access of sympathy and generous enthusiasm towards John; and He poured out on His forerunner a high-strung panegyric, in which, having touched on the outstanding features of his character, He declared, "Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of

¹ "And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force."

women there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist."

This verse is a continuation of the eulogy. Having completed the description of John's personal character, Jesus goes on to speak of his work and its results; and He still continues in the same high-strung and poetical strain. Hence the figurative and obscure terms in which His meaning is expressed. But we must hold fast to the thread of connexion—that we are in the middle of a panegyric on the Baptist¹—for it is this which determines the sense.

The mere sound of the words does not at once suggest their true meaning, but rather the reverse. But this is not unusual in the language of poetry; and it was far from unusual with Jesus, in His most exalted moods, to wrap His meaning up in enigmatical terms.

When the kingdom of heaven is spoken of as "suffering violence," the first idea which the words suggest is that a reference is being made to the persecutions to which Christianity has been so frequently subjected. And in this sense the words have sometimes been understood. But a reference to persecution is quite out of place at this point in the eulogy on John; nor, indeed, is it historical that at the date when the words were spoken Christianity had been suffering persecution.

In like manner we must put aside the notion, supported by Weiss and Morison, that the reference is to the attempts made by some of the hearers of Jesus, who united political and Messianic ambitions with their enthusiasm for Him,

¹ It is true that in the preceding verse the strain of panegyric is dropped for a moment in the remarkable words: "Notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he." That, however, it is immediately resumed again is indicated by the $\delta\epsilon$ at the beginning of our verse, on which Bengel has this note: "Antitheton, hoc sensu: quamquam Johannes minor est minimo in regno celorum, tamen jam ab initio dierum Johannis regnum celorum vim facit."

to hurry on the realisation of His kingdom by violent means. This seems to receive some justification from the fact that the word rendered "take by force" in this text is the same (*ἀρπάζω*) as that employed when it is said that they attempted to take Him by force and make Him a king. But this coincidence is purely accidental. A reference here to such unholy violence on Christ's behalf is as out of place as a reference to the violence of persecution: it has no connexion with the strain of thought which Jesus is pursuing.

What He has in view is to characterize the results of the Baptist's work, in so far as they were good and gratifying—that is, in so far as they were due to John. The lack of results, from His own work as well as John's, due to the unresponsiveness of their hearers, is enlarged upon later.¹ But here He is dealing with the revival of the spiritual life of the country caused by John's preaching.

Its features were that the kingdom of heaven suffered violence, and the violent took it by force. The kingdom of heaven seems to be conceived of as a city which the besiegers are determined to capture, because their hearts are set upon the treasures which it contains. It "suffereth violence" when they overcome the obstacles which stand in the way of their entrance to it; and then, being in, they take possession of its treasures—they "take it by force."²

There is an alternative rendering of the first clause (adopted by Melancthon, Bengel, Baur, Stier, etc.): *βιάζεται* may be middle, instead of passive,³ and signify "offereth violence," or "entereth with violence." The kingdom of heaven coming or entering with violence, as a consequence of the Baptist's activity, would naturally refer to the vehemence with which John inspired men to preach

¹ Querela incipit versu 16.—BENDEL.

² Meyer quotes from Thucydides, πόλεις τὰς βεβιασμένας.

³ Sæpe LXX. βιάζομαι ponunt, vim adhibeo.—BENDEL.

it, or to the fact that it became a universal theme of talk and testimony. And this agrees well with the form of the verse in St. Luke:¹ "Since that time the kingdom of God is preached and every man presseth into it": where two results of John's work are emphasized—the earnest preaching of the Gospel and the earnest hearing of it. The two things are really inseparable: they are the two sides of every genuine revival.

There is a holy violence in the preaching of the kingdom of heaven.

There are truths of Christianity which it is impossible to believe earnestly without feeling a certain heat and urgency in setting them forth. Such, for example, were the topics which the Baptist handled. He brought sin to remembrance; he warned men to flee from the wrath to come; he attacked public wrongs and abuses. Anyone who puts his heart into such themes has to assail men; his tone and manner must be rousing and threatening; it is intolerable to have such things spoken of in cold blood. But truths of an entirely opposite character may inspire a similar urgency. The sense of the greatness of salvation and of how much those are missing who neglect it; the philanthropic passion for the good of humanity and the onward march of progress; the warmth of love to Christ and devotion to His purpose of saving men can produce a fire of earnestness not less influential than that kindled by the terror of the Lord.

There is a temperament which imparts to preaching this militant and violent character. John undoubtedly had it. St. Paul had it in another form. He was fond of military

¹ In St. Luke it does not occur in the panegyric on the Baptist. The connexion in which it does occur is very difficult (xvi. 16); but there also, as here, what our Lord is characterizing is the hearty and enthusiastic reception of the message of John among the common people and the degraded classes, as contrasted with its rejection by the upper classes.

images in describing his work; and, in a memorable passage, he makes use of the very one here employed—the capture of a city: “For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ.” It is the temperament of the missionary, the reformer, the evangelist; and names distinguished by it might be mentioned in every era of revival.

This need not be the only mood of the preacher. While Jesus says here that the kingdom of heaven cometh with violence, He says elsewhere that it cometh “without observation”; and, while the preacher is here compared to one breaking into a city, he is compared elsewhere to the shepherd, who carries the lambs in his arms; to the sower, who has long patience, waiting for the appearance of the blade; to the fisher, who must sometimes be content to toil all the night and catch nothing. Such images suggest that there is much work for God whose processes are silent and whose results are distant. Yet, though not the only mood of the preacher, the mood which urges him forth to take men by storm and to fling himself against the strongholds of evil without calculating the consequences is a legitimate state of mind. It is more: it is sometimes obligatory; it ought not to be so rare as it is. The great preachers of the New Testament were accused of being mad. The Baptist was so reproached; so was Jesus Himself; so was St. Paul; at Pentecost St. Peter and his associates were charged with being full of new wine. How long will it be before some preachers are so accused! The wheel of routine goes round, and the old straw is threshed for the thousandth time; all is sober and sensible, but cold and unimpressive; and the strongholds of iniquity in the heart of the individual and in the practices of the

community remain unvanquished and uninvaded. It is one of the marks of a genuine revival to disturb this slumber and make preaching urgent and vehement.

On the other hand, there is a holy violence on the part of the hearers of the kingdom of heaven—"the violent take it by force."

Stier ridicules the idea that there can be any allusion in "the violent" to the fact that many of the subjects of the Baptist's revival belonged to those classes in which violence is chronic. But this is not so certain. The publicans and sinners were the most conspicuous followers of both John and Jesus; and there may be an allusion to this fact in the name by which those who capture the treasure are characterized. The publicans and sinners were children of impulse, who had rushed into evil without calculating the consequences; this exposed them the more to the force of the Baptist's appeals, because they could not hide their sins; and then, when they were pointed to the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, they followed the good impulse with the same simplicity and directness with which they had followed evil ones. But the Pharisee or Sadducee had so long been accustomed to the practices and the language of religion, that neither the appeals of John nor the invitations of Christ could penetrate his hide-bound consciousness, or excite in him any longing for the treasures of the kingdom.

The word has, however, a universal application. While, on the one hand, the kingdom of God comes with violence to enter into those to whom it is sent, there is requisite on their part a certain violence of desire and resolution to enter into it.

As the experienced Gossner says, "this is not because God is unwilling to give the treasures of His kingdom or requires them to be purchased by sour toil and at heavy

cost. On the contrary, He gives everything for nothing. As far as He is concerned, the kingdom is not a stronghold needing to be captured, but a city with open gates. All things are ready, the table is spread, all are invited to the marriage supper. The King is even angry at those who will not come."

But in man's own heart and in his circumstances there are obstacles which can only be overcome by a certain holy violence. In some cases there are evil associations and companionships from which it is necessary to break away. When a man has lived a lifetime in sin, he "is holden with the cords" of the past; and, unless he is roused by the terror of the future or obtains an overpowering sight of the destiny which he is missing, he will never escape from the coil in which he is enveloped. Even when he has been awakened, he must tear himself away and flee for his life. Almost more dangerous is the state of those who are conscious of no haunting and tormenting memories, but are slumbering in the forms of religion, while their hearts are in the world. If in the pulpit there is need of something to interrupt routine and clothe the preacher with prophetic earnestness, in many a pew there is no less necessary a new and poignant sense that God, sin and eternity are realities, and that the prizes of religion are worth an effort and a sacrifice.

Specially is this necessary at the beginning of the religious life. "Strive to enter in at the strait gate," said our Lord; and the word is as strong as He could make it: literally it is, "Agonize to enter in." The first effort to withdraw the attention from other things and fix it on this supreme concern, the wrench from old associations, the first confession of Christ are peculiarly difficult. At this point, all the enemies of the soul put forth their utmost strength. One must, therefore, be in dead earnest, and see that his all is at stake, if he is to overcome.

Yet effort does not cease here. After the city has been captured, its treasures have still to be appropriated. Too often we are like the children of Israel when they entered Canaan, who left much of the land in the hands of the enemy, though it was all their own. They would have saved themselves from many a harassing attack and humiliating restriction, and would have transmitted to their descendants spacious times of prosperity and peace, if they had acted more fully on the watchword of Joshua, "Be strong and of good courage." We are too easily content with merely being inside the kingdom: its high attainments, its glorious tasks, its joys unspeakable and full of glory we think are not for us. But God wishes us to covet earnestly the best gifts, and to claim all the rights and privileges of our citizenship in His kingdom.¹ It is one of the best signs of a true revival when those who have attained a standing in the kingdom are eagerly reaching forth to lay ampler hold of its unsearchable riches.

JAMES STALKER.

¹ Grotius calls attention to Exodus xix. 24: "Let not the priests and the people break through to come unto the Lord, lest He break forth upon them,"—an instructive contrast between the old dispensation and the new; and the verb in the LXX. is that of this text.

THREE MOTIVES TO REPENTANCE.

LUKE XIII. 1-9.

“THAT very season,” to which the first verse of this passage refers, cannot be fixed chronologically, but it can be characterised spiritually if we look back to the previous chapter. It was a season in which our Lord, like His apostle afterwards, was pressed in the spirit; an ardour unusual, or unusually visible, even for Him, glowed in all His words; He spoke of the fire He had come to cast on the earth, and His intense longing to see it take hold; of the baptism of pain that awaited Him, and of the relentless grasp in which His soul was held till it should be accomplished; of the signs of coming storm in the sky, and of the wisdom of making peace with the adversary while there was yet time. We need to remember this spiritual tension, this awful feeling of urgency, if we would do justice to our Lord’s threefold summons to repentance.

(1) The circumstances under which the Galileans were massacred by Pilate in the temple are unknown, but can easily be guessed. The Galileans were the most patriotic of the Jews, and it is natural to suppose that a disturbance, to which a political colour could be given, was summarily quelled by the governor. To the Jews, the action of Pilate was a horror of impiety: the temple had been profaned, the nation insulted, the instincts of humanity and religion outraged. No doubt there was wild excitement in Jerusalem, and it is conceivable that the story was carried to Jesus, as a person who made Messianic claims of some sort, and who might be expected to show a practical interest in the honour of the country.

Jesus startled his informants, as He startles us when we read the story, by the abrupt diversion of interest. “Do

you think that these Galileans were sinners above all Galileans, because they have suffered such things? No, I tell you : but except you repent, you shall all in like manner perish." Jesus speaks out of that tension of spirit just referred to ; He has said to Himself, This one thing I do—I strive to create in men's souls the sense of God and of their state in His sight, and I must make *everything* minister to that. We can understand in this case how He does it. The Jews as a whole were in warm sympathy with the Galileans. The same blind patriotism burned in all their bosoms, and would eventually lead them as a nation to fatal conflict with Rome. Certainly their patriotism professed to be religious ; it appealed to God, and rallied round the temple and the law ; nay, it was the consciousness of being God's people, and of having Him on their side, which animated them for battle, even in despair. Yet Jesus knew that the path on which the nation had entered could only lead to ruin ; He knew that God was calling it in Him to enter on a different path, to which, as a whole, it showed little leaning ; and He saw in the death of these Galileans, with all its atrocity of circumstance, a picture and prophecy of the doom, which, within a single generation, should overtake the race.

The moral motive to repentance is plain here. When we see lives ruined by the inevitable operation of forces which are at work in ourselves, God is summoning us with awful earnestness to change our ways. The more signal the ruin, the more urgent and imperative is the summons. When a career is blighted, a life cut short, a soul slain before our eyes, by sins to which we ourselves are not strange—by pride, by anger, by lust, by falsehood, by cowardice—what is it for ? Is the tragic impression made upon us only to pass away ? Is it to be a nine days' wonder, a thing to talk about, or to preach about ? No, it is a voice from heaven, a voice with the emphasis of a blow,

meant to stagger and shock the careless, and to make them think seriously of God.

(2) The case of the men on whom the tower fell was different. It was exactly what we call an accident, and the use made of it by Jesus raises the question whether an accident has a moral. The question is very often and very confidently answered in the negative; or if a moral is admitted, it is limited, so to speak, to the physical sphere; the accident, so far as it has a purpose at all, fulfils that purpose when it compels men to examine the causes which led to it, and to take means to prevent its recurrence. If a train leaves the rails, or a ship goes out of her course, and runs ashore on an unlighted coast, "the moral" is seen in the Board of Trade inquiry; if there is an outbreak of diphtheria or typhus, it is found in the report of the medical officer. When anyone goes outside of these, and after an appalling accident, which cuts off many lives in a moment, speaks of it as a "warning," or ventures to hint repentance, he runs the risk of being set down as a heartless fool. Why then did our Lord utilize this pure "accident," which no doubt made an immense sensation in Jerusalem, so directly and vehemently in a moral interest? Why did He say to people, who had been shocked by it, and who had felt as keenly as any moderns could the pitiableness of it, and their own inability to render any real help, Except ye repent, ye shall all in like manner perish?

We must admit that in the lips of an unfeeling man, or of a man who had only an official interest in speaking about repentance, such language would be unpardonably offensive. It is the use of it by such men that has brought it to discredit. But Christ's interest in repentance was an absorbing passion; He lived and died to make men other than they are; He knew that the change described by this word was the one thing needful for their salvation; He knew its immense difficulty, and He grudged everything—

especially He grudged every great and solemn emotion—which might have contributed to it, and did not. Men, as a rule, have little feeling, and it is this which makes their conversion hard. They live, so to speak, on the surface of their nature. Their common interests and pre-occupations are sufficient to engage them, and even to absorb and excite them, but they are rarely sufficient to reveal to them the hidden depths of their being, and to let them see that life has possibilities, and may have a purpose, which they have never contemplated. A great accident may have this heart-shaking, heart-searching, heart-revealing power. In the sight or the imagination of what has happened; in pity for the dead, for the hopes that have died with them, for the living they have left behind them; in the dim sense which visits the most hardened and the most unreflecting, that the unseen is not far off, that after death comes judgment, and that it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God; in all this solemn experience men get a new light upon their nature, were it but for a moment, and the preacher of repentance gets a moment for his work, which no arrogance and no flippancy of unspiritual criticism should induce him to throw away.

The earthquake helped to convert the Philippian jailer; the fall of a tower, a crash on the railway, an explosion in a mine, may help, and if we take Christ's example here as indicating a law, ought to help in the conversion of all who are awed and startled by them. Such emotions are the opening of the nature to greater depths, the rendering of it more accessible to God, more sensible to interests to which it has hitherto been indifferent. Our Lord, in this lesson on repentance, teaches us that the waste of emotion is a serious thing for man, a distressing thing for Him, and for all workers for God. To see men moved, and moved deeply, yet not permanently, and not to the point of changing their life to the bottom, and putting it right with God,

this it was which straitened His spirit, and moved Him to speak with such startling vehemence.

(3) It is hardly certain that the parable of the fig-tree in the vineyard was spoken in the same breath as these two passionate words: the connexion indicated by ἔλεγε δὲ (v. 6) is rather loose than stringent. But even if it were first spoken on another occasion, its insertion here is very apposite, and may serve as an illustration of that guidance of the evangelists by a higher wisdom in which their inspiration as historians is displayed. It rounds off the lessons of the passage on repentance; it presents the same appeal, with the same importunity, on what seems at first a totally different ground.

There is no denying that the urgency of vv. 1-5 is very easily evaded by most men. Massacres and appalling accidents do not happen every day nor at every door. "What happened to the Galileans," people say, "or to those eighteen, is *not* going to happen to us. I never was in a railway collision, I never knew anybody who was; I never knew a man killed suddenly, without warning; it is not a case that has to be considered, and it is absurd to make the bare supposition of it a motive in life. Such appeals miss the mark, and produce no effect, but impatient contempt."

The parable is Christ's answer to this sceptical mood. He seems to side with it, but does not allow it to evade His earnestness. All this is true, He says; the massacre and the sudden deaths *are* extraordinary resources of which God avails Himself; but His goodness also—that goodness, which by your own objection so completely makes up life that you decline to take anything else into your reckoning—that goodness also is designed to lead you to repentance. God tries every way, because men seek to evade Him by every way. He tries severity, sudden, exceptional, startling, because they take goodness for granted; He tries goodness, uniform, ever-renewed, inexhaustibly patient, because He

is good, and severity His strange work. But it would be a fatal error to presume on His goodness. The parable ends with the same inexorable refrain as the verses about the Galileans and the fall of the tower. "If it bear fruit thenceforth (Dr. Field renders *εἰς τὸ μέλλον*, on good grounds, *next year*, which is in entire keeping with the rigour of Christ's tone, as if He had said 'after *one* chance more), *well*; but if not, thou shalt *cut it down*.'" Not to repent is perdition, let men argue about it as they please; if severity does not startle them into it, if goodness does not subdue them to it, they are lost. The sternness and passion of these utterances do not deny, or even disguise, the love of Christ; they are as truly the expression of it as that cry from the depths of a divine despair with which the chapter closes, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered thy children together as a hen gathereth her brood under her wings, and ye would not." Even after this the inexorable note is struck once more: "*Behold, your house is left unto you desolate*." No one has ever spoken so severely and with such awful urgency as Jesus, because no one has ever loved like Him.

To connect the three appeals of this passage in this way does not interfere, of course, with the interpretation of details in the parable, nor with its primary application to the Jewish people; but it keeps uppermost what, I think, the evangelist intended to be uppermost—the soul-travail of Christ for the conversion of men. The three words which He speaks are three flashes from the fire burning in his heart, that passion for God and His kingdom which He found it so hard to kindle in the cold hearts of men.

JAMES DENNEY.

PROFESSOR HORT—BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1851. "The Message of the Church to Landlords." *Christian Socialist*, Oct. 11, 1851. Letter enclosing a "Prayer for Landlords," from a primer of Edw. VI., in the column of "Free Correspondence."
1854. J. S. C. P. Vol. 1. Pearson's Marginalia. (1) and (2).
Short Notice of Droessel's edn. of Clementine Homilies.
1855. J. S. C. P. Vol. 2. Review of Tregelles on printed text of N. T.
Notices of Tischendorf's Anecdota.
Notices of Baumgarten on the Acts.
Edits H. Mackenzie's Hulsean Essay on the Beneficial Influence of the Clergy during the First Ten Centuries.
1856. "Tintern, October, 1855." A poem in "Peace in War. In Memoriam L. R." (Macmillan.)
J. S. C. P. Vol. 3. On the date of Justin Martyr.
A fragment of S. Dionysius of Alexandria, discovered in Univ. Library.
A Study of "*Limes*" in elucidation of Tac. Ann. i. 50.
On the translation of the Aorist, including a full discussion of the meanings of *v̄v̄*.
Cambridge Essays. Elaborate article on "*Coleridge*."
1857. Letter to Rev. J. Ll. Davies. On the Tenure of Fellowships and on Church Patronage in Trinity College.
- 1857-60. J. S. C. P. Vol. 4. (a) Review of Tregelles and Tischendorf.
(b) Identification of the Latin Version of the lost Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on ten of St. Paul's Epistles.
(c) Review of Scrivener and Tischendorf.
1862. Thoughts on the Revised Code of Education: its purposes and probable effects.
1866. *Macmillan's Magazine*. "The Last Days of Simon de Montfort: a Fragment."
1869. *Journal of Philology*. Controversy with Lightfoot on the Doxology at the end of the Romans. (xvi. 25-27.)

1873. Edits Memorials of the late W. B. Marriott, including (1) Grinfield Lectures on Terms of Gift and Offering; (2) Treatise on the Holy Eucharist.
1876. Two Dissertations. I. On *Μονογένης Θεός* in Scripture and Tradition.
II. On the "Constantinopolitan Creed" and other Eastern Creeds of the Fourth Century.
1877. Dict. of Christian Biogr. Vol. I. 60 articles, chiefly on Gnostics, including Apelles, Bardaisan, Basilides.
1879. Prolegomena to Tregelles. Selected and edited with the help of Mr. Streane.
1881. May. The New Testament in Greek (with Dr. Westcott).
August. "Introduction" and Appendix.
1885. The New Testament in Greek. Smaller edition, with fresh appendix.
1885. *Times*, June 25, July 16. Letters on the Fayoum Fragment.
1887. *Academy*, Feb. 26, June 11. "Codex Amiatinus."
1889. Sermon in the College Chapel. "The Growth of a College into a Temple in the Universal Temple."
1890. Sermon at Dr. Westcott's Consecration.
The Sense and Service of Membership. The Measure of True Soundness in the Body.
1892. Dict. of National Biography. "J. B. Lightfoot."
No date. A Paper on *Hebrews* i. 8.

Subjects of Public Lectures:

- N. T. St. James.
1 St. Peter.
1 Corinthians (College only).
Galatians (College only).
Romans.
Ephesians.
Pastoral Epistles.
Apocalypse i.-iii.
Patristic. Origen c. Celsum, v., vi.
Irenæus, iii., iv.
Clement of Alex., Strom., vii.

Subjects of Public Lectures (*continued*):

Patristic. Lactantius.

Tatian, Address to Greeks.

Clementine Recognitions.

Tertullian adv. Marc., iv., v.

Judaistic Christianity in Apostolic and following Age.

Early Conceptions and Early History of Christian Ecclesia.

J. O. F. MURRAY.

THE EARLIER IDEAS OF ISAIAH.

THOUGH the Book of Isaiah be not disposed throughout on a strict chronological principle, it is probable that chapters i.-vi. belong in the main to the earliest period of his prophetic history. It is extremely difficult no doubt to find a historical situation for all parts of chapter i. at an early period of his career; but on the other hand the tremendous power of the passage and the nature of several of the thoughts in it, such as Jehovah's appeal to heaven and earth (for to whom else could He appeal?) that He had nourished and brought up children and they had rebelled against Him, and the Lament over Jerusalem: "How is the city that was faithful become an harlot!" suggest a very early time. Such figures appear to express the first fresh consciousness in the prophet's mind of the real nature of the situation and the meaning of the people's condition. If supposed spoken in the time of Sennacherib, at the end of a ministry of forty years, they are very unnatural and lose very greatly in meaning.

From the place of the inaugural vision, chapter vi., in the collection it may be supposed that it was not published at the time it was revealed, or that it was republished in a new connexion. It is the opinion of some scholars that it bears marks of having been retouched by the author. This is quite possible, for the prophets were always practical teachers, and continually kept in view the great object of influencing men at the moment in any work which they undertook. The desire to reproduce any revelation exactly

as it was communicated was always subordinate to the desire to influence the people, and, if subsequent revelation had supplemented the former before it was committed to writing, there was no anxiety felt by the prophet to keep the two sedulously apart. It is thought that the picture of the desolation of the country and the idea of the hardening of the people's heart under the prophet's preaching were not likely to have been presented so broadly in the vision that determined him to assume the rôle of prophet. But there is one thing always to be remembered in such cases, and that is that the call to be a prophet was not the first step in the prophet's history (Jer. i. 5). The call was the second step; endowment with a certain cast of mind, a certain range both of thought and susceptibility, was the first. When we look at the work of men called of God, whether it be now or of old, the call appears to us to be rather a consecration than a communication, a fire from God that sets aglow the whole nature rather than anything added. This fire, it may be, purifies the nature and sets free all that is loftiest in its thoughts and feelings and also enables it to reach upwards to what it would never otherwise have attained to. Nevertheless we see how greatly the natural character of the prophet's mind reveals itself in the word which he speaks. This is to such an extent the case that it sometimes even disquiets us. We are almost led to say that the prophet's conception of God is just a reflexion of his own character, of the prevailing tone of his own mind, and we ask, Is there objective truth in it? Can we rely upon it as anything but a brilliant idealizing of that which the prophet himself was? It is certainly true that the idea of God set forth by each particular prophet does bear this relation to his own mind. Yet when we think that the prophetic call was not an accidental thing but the call of one formed in the womb to be called; that God's hand was upon them from their earliest being, and

that their nature was part of their prophetic endowment, our disquiet disappears. Each of these minds of men called to be prophets was a feeble counterpart of some side or some view of the mind of God, and just as the white light is made up of many separate colours so the perfect nature of God revealed in Scripture is formed by the colours reflected from the natures of various prophets, for it takes many human minds to make up the fulness of the Divine mind. Though the vision recorded in chapter vi. impressed Isaiah in such way as to lead him to take henceforth a public place among his people, the individual thoughts contained in it were probably not new to him. He had often thought of Jehovah as the Holy One before; the state of society about him had often occupied his mind; and he had certainly more than once forecast its issue. But now under an influence from on high all these things together presented themselves with a clearness and took possession of his mind with a force which compelled him to come forth and speak to men as the messenger of God. There is a curious fact which casts light upon the fixity of his ideas from the earliest moment of his prophetic career. He probably began to prophesy about the year 739, and three years later he has a child old enough to accompany him to the conduit of the upper pool (vii. 3), and this child bore the name of Shear Jashub, *a remnant shall turn*. From this it is clear that his great idea that only a remnant would be saved was one with which he started on his career, and this idea presupposes the desolation of the country, which again implies the people's persistence in unbelief—If ye will not believe, ye shall not be established (vii. 9).

The inaugural vision of Isaiah contains in brief an outline of his prophetic teaching. The passage besides this has a singular psychological and religious interest of a kind personal to the prophet. It consists of a series of steps

each one of which naturally follows upon the other. There is first a vision of the Lord, the King, surprising and majestic, with a singular world of beings and activities around him (*vv.* 1-4). Then this vision of Jehovah reacts upon the mind of the prophet and makes him think of himself in relation to this great King, the Holy One, whom he had seen; and one thought succeeds another so that in a moment he lives a history (*vv.* 5-7). Then having passed through this history, the beginning of which was terror, but the end of it peace, an altogether new sensation filled his mind, as if the world, which was all disorder and confusion before, and filled with a conflict of tendencies and possibilities, had suddenly, in the light falling on it from the great King whom he had seen, become clear and the meaning of it plain, and also what was his own place in it; and this was accompanied with an irresistible impulse to take his place. This is expressed by saying that he heard the voice of the great Sovereign who had been revealed to him proclaiming that he had need of one to send—Who will go for us?—to which he replied that he would go,—Send me! And finally there comes the service which he has to perform, which is no other than just to take his place in the midst of that world the meaning of which his vision of the Sovereign Lord had made clear to him, and state this meaning to men, to hold the mirror up to his time and declare to it its condition and its tendencies, and what in the hand of the great King, God over all, its issue and the issue of all must be (*vv.* 8-13).

The vision which the prophet had was that of the King, sitting on a throne, high and lifted up. All the great prophets had at the beginning such a vision of Jehovah, God of Israel. They were prophets of the Lord, their message was from Him, it was of Him that they spoke to the people, it was their vision of Him that made them speak. They did not find Him, He broke upon them in His majesty, and

they came forth from His presence with an awe upon them which never left them, and a force of conviction that never deserted them, and with the feeling of an imperative necessity lying on them to speak of him to men which they could not themselves resist.

It is not certain whether the vision was seen by Isaiah before the death of King Uzziah or after it—it was in the year that he died. If we could fancy it to have been seen after his death, some things in it might be more naturally accounted for. It was a vision that might well have been created by such a momentous death, the death of one once a king, and one so powerful, holding such a place among the forces of society, bridling them with so firm a hand—a hand now relaxed, leaving the unquiet humours of the land to assert themselves and draw the state on to its destruction. Perhaps only the thought of the death of such a king could have led the prophet's mind to draw that comprehensive sketch of the history and the destiny of his nation with which the chapter ends. But however we may suppose external events to have contributed to the operations of the prophet's mind, and certainly the opener and acuter we conceive the sensibilities of the prophets to circumstances around them to have been, the better shall we understand them, the great interest of the vision lies in the mental history which it exhibits. The "call" of the prophet, as we name it, was a crisis in his personal life, and his "office," as we speak, was nothing but the life task which the crisis made imperative. Nothing stood between Isaiah and being a prophet but the uncleanness of his lips; and nothing was needed to furnish him with his message from the King but just to *see* Him.

"I saw the Sovereign (Adonai) sitting on a throne; about him stood the Seraphim, and they cried one to another, and said, Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts." The general truth expressed by this scene, which is but a re-

flection of the service of Jehovah in His temple among men, is this: That there is a transcendental world within or behind this outer world, a world of spiritual powers, which are the forces that rule the destinies of this world in which we live. There is a Sovereign, majestic and lifted up, whose glory fills the earth. Around Him there are beings who know what He is, and who render Him the homage due; beings full of power and life, covering their faces with their wings lest the too great light of the Divine face should fall on theirs and blind them; covering their feet also, conscious, though perfect, of their imperfection before Him, and out of reverence concealing that in them which to His eyes might seem uncomely; ever in flight, swift to do His commandments; though conscious of their weakness, and awed before His majesty, yet not so abashed but that they can serve Him with a ready will; giving unending expression to that sense of what Jehovah is which fills their mind in the cry, Holy is the Lord of hosts! The cry of Holy! hardly ascribes any attribute to Jehovah such as moral purity; it rather expresses Godhead, transcendent majesty. At the same time "holy" already expresses, or at least connotes, moral purity, for the prophet immediately thinks of his own uncleanness, and fears death. Nor does he fear death merely from the physical nature of Deity reacting against the creature; he fears it from the moral nature of the Ruler. "Woe is me, I perish, for, being a man of unclean lips, mine eyes have seen the King." The smoke that filled the house is hardly to be regarded as a symbol of the dark side of the self-manifesting God coming into view and his anger against sin. Analogies for such an interpretation of the smoke in the house seem wanting. The cloud of smoke is rather the manifestation of Himself (iv. 5). The King, high and lifted up, is not immovable. He responds and gives a fuller token of Himself. On the spirits adoring what they knew there breaks a fuller know-

ledge and a more sensible nearness. If in the busy day the pillar seems cloud and smoke, in stiller hours it lightens into fire. And to the eastern seer God was a light more distinct and clearer far than to the dimmer vision of the western eye, when

On the glimmering limit far withdrawn
God made Himself an awful rose of dawn.

The feeling of Jehovah's universal kingship leads to the next step in the vision: "Then said I, Woe is me, I perish. Then flew one of the Seraphim with a live coal and touched my lips, saying, Thine iniquity is taken away." The sight of the King reacted on the prophet, and made him think of himself. In such a presence the consciousness of himself rose like a blush to his face or a pallor of terror. Perhaps men universally carry with them a sense of their relation to God. We cannot think of Him out of relation to ourselves. Our thought of Him includes thought of ourselves. The prophet's thought of Him as the King immediately awakened terror in his mind. This may not be the way in which we need think of God still. Many things have happened since this prophet lived. God has commended his love to us. It was certainly not unnatural that, being suddenly brought face to face with the King, the prophet should be seized with terror because of his uncleanness. He thought of the uncleanness of his lips, though it did not lie there alone; but a man's words are the expression of his heart, and his lips are the organ of this expression, as it is said: Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen, because their tongue and their doings are against the Lord to provoke the eyes of His glory (iii. 8). Perhaps he thought of his lips from hearing the praises of the Seraphim, in which he was unfit to join (Zeph. iii. 9). There he practically felt his uncleanness, and that he was a stranger to that holy circle that surrounded the great

King. But what is of interest is that the prophet's feeling of fear was succeeded by another. Though the first, it was not the last condition of his mind. In a brief space he lived a history, and thought succeeded thought of his relation to God. A seraph seemed to fly to him with a live coal from the altar and touch his lips, saying, Thy sin is purified. The two things are embraced in the full effect of the vision of God. First it may be fear, but then the stilling of the fear. First the sense of sin, but following it the sense of sin purged away by a fire from the Lord's presence. Just as on seeing the great King he felt that, though on earth, he was not without, but far within the sweep of the King's holy rule, so the laying of this coal to his lips made him feel that he was equally within the sweep of the purifying fire from God. The symbolism is very simple. The altar is no doubt that of burnt-offering, for, apart from all questions about the altar of incense, a hot coal or stone would scarcely be found there. Nothing appears to depend on the altar, except that it furnished a hot coal from God's presence. The uncleanness of men must be purified with fire—with a fire from God.

The purification of Isaiah's lips led to the third step in the vision: "I heard the voice of the Lord saying, Who will go for us? And I said, Send me"! The psychological consecutiveness of the steps is singular. The removal of the prophet's sin lifted him up out of the sphere in which he felt himself before, dwelling among a people of unclean lips, and made him belong to that heavenly sphere which had been revealed to him. He was now one in sympathy with this, and immediately there followed the impulse to enter upon the service of the great King. The sight of the Ruler which he had received enabled him to take his place in the world, and see what it became him to do. It is not of course any mere abstract conception of God that will enable or compel men to do this. It is a sight of God the

Ruler, of one who holds the world together, in whom the universe, society, and human life consist. And it is a sight of Him amidst the circumstances of our life, throwing light upon them, classifying them, bringing them into order, showing us their meaning, and their needs, and the issue of them. It was in the year that King Uzziah died that the prophet had this vision. Uzziah was a strong king. He held the reins tight. The resources of the nation were enlarged by him, and the forces of revolution kept under. His death is the turning-point in the history of Judah. From now downwards it begins to decline. The forces of dissolution were working long ere this time, but the firm hand of the king repressed them. The great characteristic of the age was religious insensibility. That which the prophet had been enabled to see, a Divine world within this outer world, was the thing which the nation could not be made to perceive. Men could not be impressed with the idea of a living God, a Sovereign high and lifted up ruling the destinies of the world. "They said to the seers, See not, and to the prophets, Prophecy to us smooth things. Get ye out of the way, turn you out of the path, have done with the 'Holy One of Israel' in our hearing" (xxx. 10). A Sovereign ruling over the world and life and men's consciences they would have none of. The heart of the people was fat, their ears were heavy, and their eyes closed. And this insensibility led to formalism, to distrust of Jehovah, and when danger threatened to compromising alliances with the great foreign empires, in the collision of which with one another the little state must inevitably be crushed to pieces. Perhaps the death of Uzziah might have suggested some of this to the prophet, and brought it suddenly before his mind. But it was the vision of Jehovah that cast the real light upon the world, the revelation of a great Ruler behind all things, the real power in the world, a fire in contact with the evil and impurity of mankind, which must

consume them or cleanse it; it was this that made the prophet perceive the true meaning of the circumstances of his time, and compelled him, now conscious of his own right relation to this Ruler, to assume his place in regard to the world of his day, and speak to it that which he had learned. His teaching is just the counterpart of what had happened to himself—Woe is me, I am undone! Lo this hath touched thy lips, and thy sin is purged! The fire from God's altar purged his sin, and the blood of Jerusalem shall be purged from the midst of her by a blast of burning (iv. 4). The cities shall be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man. Yet it shall be as a teil tree, or as an oak, whose stock remains when they are cut down; the holy seed is the stock thereof, and out of it springs a new life.

It is singular how in a moment the whole outline of God's purpose and of his own prophetic work stood out before the prophet's eyes. All his life long he has little else to say than he says here of Jehovah the King, and of the people in that figure of the tree cut down to the roots. The thought of his life and his prophecies is this thought of the Sovereign, the Holy One of Israel, and this thought he throws into the history of his people, on which it acts like a fire or a hewer in the forest, withering or cutting even with the ground every growth of the people's life and even the people itself, yet leaving an indestructible stock out of which a new people shall arise. In a moment all this stood out before the prophet's eyes, his conception of what Jehovah was and was doing, or must do, and that of the nature and scope of his own prophetic work. We see something like this sometimes in ourselves. There is a distant resemblance to it at times in our intellectual life. In some moment of higher mental power than we usually possess, we may fling out the outline of all that we shall ever think or do. All our after life is but busied in filling in with

colour and shade what in one moment of our early life we had drawn in sketch and outline. And sometimes, in after years, when some thought occurs to us which we think fresh or new, we are surprised perhaps to find the rough cast of it in something which we did long ago. It is in our early days when the mind is fresh and creative that the impression made on it by the world and life is deepest, and its response most vigorous. And this response is the contribution which we make to the life or the thought of mankind, and it is not unusual to find that we make it in a moment, and that after years do little but amplify or expand it. And there is an analogy from another side of the mind's experience even closer than this from our intellectual history.

The prophet's thoughts at this period are few if great. They are in the main these three: (1) His thought of the Lord, the King. (2) His thought of the people in their insensibility to the majesty and rule of the King. And (3) these two thoughts when brought together inevitably create the third—that of the annihilation of the people down to a remnant, that the Lord may be exalted on that day. At this period these appear to be purely abstract religious conceptions in the mind of the prophet. He has not, as yet, in view any instrument to be used in the destruction of the people. It is a moral necessity.

It is evident that the prophet's conception of Jehovah is the source of his other conceptions, though this may be said of all the prophets. His conception is singularly lofty and pure. The vision is but the service in the temple transfigured. One might almost fancy that the prophet had fallen into a trance while beholding the service in the sanctuary and musing on its real meaning. Suddenly the house and the service and the altar and the ministers became transfigured, the walls went apart and the roof lifted itself up till it seemed the high dome of God's temple on high under which he stood, and the Lord the King sat upon his

throne receiving the adoration of all holy minds. The question whether the temple or palace was the earthly or heavenly temple is an idle one. And equally irrelevant are such questions as, Where did the prophet feel himself standing? Such questions are hardly to be asked, and consistency in regard to locality is not to be sought in such ideal scenes.

Again corresponding to the prophet's conception of Jehovah as the King whose majesty fills the whole earth is his conception of the sin of men. This also is a purely spiritual thing: it is insensibility to the majesty of the King. On the one hand this may be mere pride of self, which fails to recognise the Ruler above. Or it may go further, and be distrust and want of faith in His power and rule. Or, once more, it may be disregard of His will and Himself and active opposition in deeds which provoke the eyes of His Majesty. The essence of sin is everywhere the same. The prophet's idea appears in his singular analysis of the working of the mind of the king of Assyria (chap. x. 7 *seq.*), and his threat that the Lord "will punish the fruit of the proud heart of the king of Assyria, and the glory of his high looks." So it is the "pride of heart" of the inhabitants of Samaria that brings the chastisement of "adversaries" upon them. And even the sin of the women of Jerusalem is the same: "Because the daughters of Zion are haughty, and walk with stretched out necks, walking and mincing as they go," therefore the crown of their head shall be smitten with a scab (chap. iii. 16).¹ The passage chapter v. 11 *seq.* is to the same effect. It is to prostitute the prophetic writings to drag them down into the arena of modern party strife on social questions and the "drink

¹ The "wanton" eyes of A. V., or the "ogling" eyes of others, introduces an idea foreign to the connexion. There seems no reference to immorality. It is the pride of beauty and attire, which has no mind for the Ruler above, which is punished with all that makes loathsome.

traffic," a thing unknown in those days. The prophet may reprobate excess in wine, but it is less this than another thing which he reprobates: it is the heathenish merriment, the ungodly levity of life, which has no thought nor eyes for the Divine in the world's history: "The harp and the viol and the tabret and the pipe and wine are in their feasts, but they regard not the work of the Lord, nor consider the operation of His hands." Therefore shall this light of life and its joy and its music be swallowed up in the darkness of She'ol (chap. v. 13, 14).

To the prophet this seemed inevitable. Men's insensibility to the sovereign Ruler must be broken in upon. The Lord will reveal Himself in His majesty. And realizing His manifestation as actually breaking on the world, the prophet exclaims to men, "Enter into the rock and hide thee in the dust from before the terror of the Lord, and from the glory of His majesty. The lofty looks of man shall be brought low, and the haughtiness of men shall be bowed down, and Jehovah alone shall be exalted on that day" (chap. ii. 10). And connecting his conception of Jehovah with the old idea of the day of the Lord (Amos. v. 18) he proceeds: "For the Lord of hosts shall have a day upon all that is proud and haughty, and it shall be brought low . . . the loftiness of man shall be bowed down, and Jehovah alone shall be exalted on that day." It is possible that the "day" of the Lord originally meant a battle-day, but if so this special allusion had been long lost. No foe or other instrument of Jehovah's wrath appears alluded to in these early chapters (the passage in the end of chapter v. is hardly to be connected immediately with that chapter). It is the revelation of Jehovah's majesty that brings Him to the knowledge of men; a revelation before which nature quakes and men hide themselves in the earth. So powerful is the prophet's conception of the majesty of Jehovah and the recognition due to it from men that their insensibility awakens

a certain animosity in his mind, and he represents the Lord interposing among men, and, with a kind of indiscriminate fury, reducing society to a chaos by removing every one whom men called great and on whom they relied—"the Lord of hosts shall remove the stay and staff; the mighty man, and the man of war; the judge, and the prophet, and the diviner, and the elder; the captain of fifty, and the honourable man, and the counsellor." Every head that rose above the mass shall be smitten down. Cease ye from man, for wherein is he to be accounted of!

Naturally, if the essence of men's sin be this insensibility to the majesty of the King, the essence of true religion is the opposite condition of mind, faith in the sovereign Ruler. In the earlier prophecies this comes less to expression, though it is suggested in the passage quoted from chapter v. 11 (cf. v. 19, 21, 24), but it is abundantly visible in the second stage of the prophet's ministry. To Ahaz his words were, "If ye will not believe, ye shall not be established" (vii. 9); and of himself he says, "I will trust in Jehovah who hideth His face from the house of Israel, and will wait for him" (viii. 17). And the same note is heard through all the subsequent prophecies: "They that are escaped of the house of Jacob shall stay upon the Lord, the Holy One of Israel in truth" (x. 20). "In that day shall a man look to his Maker, and his eyes shall be toward the Holy One of Israel" (xvii. 7, cf. xxx. 15, xxxi. 1-3, etc.). The principle of religion is the same in the Old Testament as in the New.

The immediate consequence of the revelation of the King in His majesty, the destruction of the sinful kingdom and the exaltation of the Lord of hosts in judgment (v. 16) is chiefly dwelt upon in the earlier prophecies; the more remote consequence, the restitution of the kingdom, is less alluded to. Indeed the authenticity of almost all the passages where it appears has been contested by one scholar or another, *e.g.* ch. ii. 2-4, iv. and vi. 13 last clause. It was natural that when

danger threatened, the indestructibility of the kingdom of the Lord should be insisted on, and accordingly it is in the second and subsequent stages of the prophet's career that the idea is most prominent. It would be strange, however, if the idea were wholly absent from the prophecies of the earliest period. Because the idea, like all the prophet's other ideas, is but a consequence of his great conception of the Lord the King. The kingdom is His, and like Himself it is eternal—"What shall one answer to the messengers of the nations? That the Lord hath founded Zion, and in her shall the poor of His people find refuge?" (xiv. 32). Whether chapter i. be a unity belonging all to one period or not, the Dirge over Jerusalem must surely be very early, and in it the restitution is clearly stated: "I will restore thy judges as at the first, and thy councillors as at the beginning: afterward thou shalt be called the righteous city, the faithful city" (chapter i. 26). And though difficulties beset chapter iv., they are outweighed by the probabilities in favour of the prophet's authorship.

A. B. DAVIDSON.

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

III. SOME SECONDARY FEATURES.

IN the discussion of so intricate a problem as that of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, it is clearly desirable to portion out the phenomena as definitely as we can, and to form an estimate, as soon as we find it practicable to do so, of the relative importance of the different groups. Now the resemblances in substance, order, and language, broadly considered, between the first three Gospels, and the matter common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, but not found elsewhere, are, in regard to their mass at all events, so much more striking than any other characteristics of the Gospels which seem to have a bearing on the solution of the Synoptic problem, that we may justly call them primary features.

To this extent there would probably be very general agreement. As to whether we should reserve this name for these two classes of phenomena and treat all else as subsidiary, or as to the amount of significance which belongs to other facts, there would naturally be more difference of opinion. I should not venture myself to say that all other phenomena are secondary, though it seems to me that those to which I shall be referring in this paper may fairly be so described, without any intention to represent them as unimportant. But I admit that in such an investigation every classification must be more or less provisional till a real solution is reached, if it ever is reached.

1. Certain of the facts may, according to the manner in which they are viewed, be connected with or detached from those main groups which I have already indicated. For example, the bulk of the phenomena of agreement between the first three Gospels can, in the view of a large number of

critics at the present day, be best explained on the assumption that the first and third used a document substantially the same as our St. Mark. But the possibility cannot be excluded that St. Mark, in its exact present form, may contain touches derived from St. Matthew and St. Luke, which were imparted to it by an editor or editors, or simply by copyists, who were familiar with these two Gospels. Out of the general mass of agreements, some may be singled out for investigation which can, it may be thought, be thus most easily accounted for. It may conceivably in this way be established that the original Mark, (*Ur-Marcus*) differed more or less considerably from our St. Mark, and some idea may be formed of the character of the differences. And speculation of this kind may even be pushed so far as essentially to modify the view at which so many critics have arrived, that the dependence is mainly on the side of St. Matthew and St. Luke; and to carry us back a considerable distance in the direction of the position which is now so generally discarded, that St. Mark is compiled from them. I do not propose to enter into this question, as it would take me too far out of the course of inquiry which I have been following.

2. Again, in the opinion of Mr. F. P. Badham¹ the "doublets, repetitions, and inconsistencies" in the several Gospels would certainly rank among the primary features. In fact he finds mainly in them the key to the whole problem. I shall refrain from discussing his theory also. Mr. Badham works it out with great ingenuity, and his argument merits careful consideration on the part of those who are making a special study of the Synoptic problem. But he is at variance with the views of the majority of other investigators on some of the points on which there is most tendency to agreement. And it will be generally felt that a new theory must obtain some important adhe-

¹ *The Formation of the Gospels*, 1891.

sions, before it becomes worth while to make it the subject of minute criticism in papers intended for general readers. Yet one or two remarks on the inferences to be drawn from "doublets" may not be out of place. Mr. Badham allows that "history repeats itself," and that "our Lord may have reiterated His maxims frequently." But he adds: "It is unlikely that the earliest Evangelists, with a plethora of material, would reproduce such reiteration in writing. In the case of didactic incidents, they would naturally record one of a kind."¹

By the help of this principle, which has been applied for the analysis of Genesis and other books of the Hexateuch into earlier elements, he thinks that he can distinguish documents which have been put together in our Gospels. But it seems at least somewhat to detract from the reliableness of this method in the case of the Gospels, that the writers of our present Gospels cannot, at the furthest, have been removed by more than a generation or so from "the earliest evangelists." If, therefore, it did not seem to our evangelists unnecessary to embody incidents and sayings closely similar in form, it is difficult to say that those who were only by a comparatively short interval their predecessors, and shared their intellectual temper, and who, *ex hypothesi*, found these similar narratives current in tradition or knew them to be actually connected with different occasions, should in many instances have recorded both. I would add that the number of what can fairly be regarded as "doublets" seems to me to be often much exaggerated, and that of the points which can reasonably be reckoned as inconsistencies, vastly so.

Nevertheless, the question of the existence of "doublets" is not without importance; it has a bearing, as it seems to me, on the subject which was discussed in my last paper. It will be very generally conceded at the present time that

¹ *The Formation of the Gospels*, p. 11.

some reduplications of events, and of sayings, may have taken place through the same fact being handed down by different reporters. And further, it may be taken for certain that our Lord must have made many different applications of the same sayings, and worked out what were substantially the same figures of speech in slightly varying ways. This is in accordance with the laws of the human mind, and in particular all do it who are in any sense prophets,—who feel that they have a message to mankind. How eminently this is true, for example, of Carlyle and Ruskin. Or to take another example: F. D. Maurice wrote towards the end of his life, “I have but a few things to say, and I can but repeat them.” It is a sign of depth and intensity, not of poverty of thought, so to repeat. Moreover, it was necessary that our Lord should so act in order that the truths to be conveyed might be duly impressed upon the minds of His hearers.

Now when we realise that, as indeed even the repetitions in a single Gospel taken by itself would show, pieces of teaching or incidents must have been recorded in written documents, or in oral tradition, which had much in common, but yet had some traits or attendant circumstances which differentiated them, we see how possible it is that in the case of many of the parallel narratives in St. Matthew and St. Luke which have been treated as both derived from the “Logia,” their diverse settings and other peculiarities in each, may in reality point to a difference of derivation. And at all events it cannot be legitimate, both, on the one hand, to infer that “doublets” when occurring in the *same* work, whether it be Genesis or a Gospel, are a sign of *difference of source*, but that when two narratives in *different* Gospels bear precisely the kind of relation to one another that “doublets” do, they must be taken from *the same source*. And this inconsistency cannot but bring home to our minds how far we still are from any well-ascertained principles of critical inquiry.

3. There is another group of facts which, though it may justly be reckoned as a subsidiary one, needs to be considered here with somewhat greater care, because it has a more direct bearing on the relation of the Synoptists to the "Logia." One class of agreements between St. Mark and the other two Synoptists—or more particularly between him and St. Matthew—seems to stand on a different footing from the rest. Though St. Mark is mainly occupied with narratives of incidents, including short sayings, he does at some critical points in his Gospel, give portions of discourses which are also reported in the other two. But whereas he is, as a rule, fuller than St. Matthew or St. Luke in the narratives that he has in common with them, he is briefer in these reports of discourses than St. Matthew, and also, in one instance, than St. Luke. They give what he gives, but they have more that is closely connected with it.¹ It may, therefore, be doubted whether in this class of passages, his is really the most original account.

Weiss's theory that St. Mark, as well as the authors of the first and third Gospels, knew and used the "Logia," the "oldest Apostolic source," as he terms it, may most reasonably be made to rest mainly on the ground of the phenomena just noted.² He would thus explain these discourses

¹ The passages referred to are :—

On the power by which Christ cast out devils—Mark iii. 23-30 ; Matt. xii. 24-37 ; Luke xi. 15-26.

The teaching by Parables—Mark iv. 1-34 ; Matt. xiii. 1-52 ; Luke viii. 5-18 ;

The charge to the twelve—Mark vi. 8-13 ; Matt. x. 5-42 ; Luke ix. 3-5 ;

Concerning offences—Mark ix. 35-50 ; Matt. xviii. 1-35 ; Luke ix. 46-50 ;

Denunciation of the Pharisees and Scribes—Mark xii. 38-40 ; Matt. xxiii. ; Luke xx. 45-47 ;

Discourse on the Last Things—Mark xiii. ; Matt. xxiv., xxv. ; Luke xxi. 25-36.

The preaching of the Baptist—Mark i. 7, 8 ; Matt. iii. 3-12 ; Luke iii. 7-17.

² He did not state the evidence quite as I have done. His statement seems to me to mix up the points which appear most favourable to his view with

which are preserved, in some measure in all three, and so far as they all extend, in nearly identical form. They all drew from the same document, the great repertory of the discourses of the Lord. Weiss does not, however, stop here. Having once assumed a knowledge of the "Logia" on the part of St. Mark, and seeing, too, that he does not restrict the contents of the "Logia" to discourses, he is naturally tempted to derive many passages that the three Synoptists have in common from the "Logia." He further accounts for the facts noted under (4), below, by this same theory. Supposing all three Evangelists to be drawing from the "Logia" in the passages where, in two of the three parallels, the phenomena in question occur, he thinks there are details in the "Logia" which St. Mark omitted, but which were retained by the other two.

Weiss does not, however, appear to have made any converts. There is an arbitrariness about the explanations offered by this theory, which renders it very unattractive. No clear criteria seem to be left for determining what came from the "Logia" and what from recollections of St. Peter's preaching. There are, moreover, more fundamental objections to it. St. Mark is not averse to giving full accounts. On the contrary, in what all three relate, he is usually the fullest. There is no good reason why he should have made an exception in the case of discourses, if he had access to the same comparatively full report of them as the other two.¹ It would be still more strange that he should not, either in fuller or briefer form, have given the Sermon on the Mount, the delivery of which not less clearly marked an epoch, and which contained teaching certainly not less

others the bearing of which is most debatable. See his *Introduction to N.T.*, p. 222, n. 1.

¹ As a matter of fact, too, in a tolerably long discourse, *on eating with unwashed hands*, Mark vii. 5-23, he is somewhat fuller than St. Matthew (xv. 2-20) while St. Luke is wanting. Again, in the chief example of the *Teaching by Parables*, the parable of the sower and its interpretation, he is the fullest.

characteristic, than the discourses actually reported by him did. Yet this was by common consent contained in the "Logia."

Another and probably the more common view of the relation of the three Synoptists to one another in the passages now under consideration, is, that here too the first and third copied from St. Mark, but that they wove the additional matter which they found in their other source on to that which he had recorded. It should, however, be observed, that in this other source there clearly *may* have been contained not only the additional matter which St. Matthew and (in one instance) St. Luke give, but also portions corresponding to, and even verbally identical with, those which St. Mark has preserved. Indeed, it seems most probable that this should have been the case, for the discourses in question in St. Matthew, and in the one case in St. Luke, present a general appearance of being connected wholes. And the additional sayings sometimes clearly presuppose words similar to St. Mark's in the source from which they are taken. See, for example, Matt. xii. 27, 28, and Luke xi. 19, 20; or again, Matt. xxiii. 3-5. Again, it is surely improbable that one of the principle sources from which our St. Matthew was derived should have contained only the parables which St. Mark does not give, and not the most striking parable of all, that of the sower.

Now, if we are justified by these considerations, in inferring that another document besides St. Mark, of which the latter was independent, had some corresponding matter, this helps us to realise that narratives and sayings and even discourses, might be handed down in more or less closely similar form by different channels, and tends to show that the assumption which many critics are wont to make, that wherever there is identity of form in two of the Gospels there must be direct dependence upon one

another, or upon a common document, is without foundation.

4. I pass on to another secondary feature. Even in the narrative portions where all three Synoptists are parallel, there are some touches, occasional similarities of form, both in sayings and descriptions, common to St. Matthew and St. Luke, but not contained in St. Mark. These, though limited in number, are noticeable from the contrast they present to the prevailing characteristics of the relationship of St. Matthew and St. Luke to St. Mark. For it is well-known that, while in many phrases all three agree, where two only agree, St. Mark is usually one of them.

It must probably have occurred independently to many students of the Synoptic problem, as it had to the present writer, that the cases of which I am now speaking must be the crucial ones for deciding whether St. Luke was directly dependent upon our St. Matthew. And it is upon these cases mainly that Simons bases his argument in his thesis entitled, "*Did the third evangelist use the canonical Matthew?*"¹ He thinks, indeed, that he finds other signs of such a use. But he lays no great stress on them; and in considering the theory we may safely confine our attention, at least in the first instance, to this class of facts.

Simons' thesis was directed against two other explanations of the phenomena in question; (a) that of Holtzmann, who supposed them to be relics of the use of the *Original Mark*, which he imagined to be not in all points fully and completely represented in our St. Mark. This theory its author has since abandoned; (b) that of Weiss, already referred to, that they were derived from the "Logia," to which in the passages in question all three Synoptists were indebted, but from which St. Matthew and St. Luke had in common retained some traits which St. Mark had omitted.

¹ *Hat der dritte Evangelist den kanonischen Matthäus benutzt?* Von Eduard Simons. Bonn, 1880.

Against both of these Simons' argument appears to be very telling. And it is, so far as it extends, a clear and thorough piece of work. He examines the words and expressions which they both have, and which are not in the parallel passages in St. Mark, and also their common omissions from St. Mark. Omissions of themselves should not count for much. The same motive might influence two writers to make them in using St. Mark. Nevertheless, when, taken in conjunction with more positive features, their effect is, that a sentence or passage as a whole has acquired the same cast in both, they are worthy of being noted. When the whole set of phenomena are collected together, though they are confined to slight touches, they undoubtedly suffice to make a definite impression upon the mind, and to suggest Simons' explanation.¹

But, on the other side, the difficulties of the view that St. Luke used our St. Matthew have to be considered. With these, Simons does not really grapple. He shows, indeed, a certain consciousness both of the slenderness of the evidences of connection, and of the many particulars in which the two evangelists differ, for he repeatedly insists that he supposes the similarities to have been produced only by *reminiscences* of the canonical St. Matthew on the part of the third evangelist. It must still remain strange that his reminiscences should not have been of a more substantial kind. Further he acknowledges that the differences between the two Gospels would be fatal to his theory, were it not for the "Logia." When these differences are too troublesome he has the resource of suggesting that St. Luke followed this document instead of the canonical St. Matthew.² But he subjects this explanation

¹ As illustrations of passages in which such agreements of St. Matthew and St. Luke, against St. Mark, occur, take Matt. ix. i-8 : Luke v. 17-26 (Mark ii. 1-12). Matt. xxi. 23-27 ; Luke xx. 1-8 (Mark xi. 27-33). Matt. xxi. 33-46 ; Luke xx. 9-19 (Mark xii. 1-12).

² Simons, *ib.*, p. 8.

to no such examination as, even on the assumption that both evangelists did use the "Logia," it would require; while if our conclusion in the last article was correct, the ground is here cut away from under his feet.

We have to consider, then, whether the agreements between the first and third Gospels of the class now before us, can be explained otherwise than by assuming a knowledge and recollection of the one by the other. I believe that the operation of the following causes is sufficient to account for them. (a) In adapting St. Mark's narrative some of the same changes would naturally suggest themselves to both writers. Many coincidences between them might occur, which it would not be fair to call the result of accident; for the same general principles would in part guide both evangelists in dealing with the same authority. (b) Tradition as known to both may have been marked by these forms of expression in which they differ from St. Mark. (c) For some of the similarities, copyists may be responsible. A process of assimilation in the texts of the Gospels may have been going on at a time prior to the earliest of which textual criticism can give us any information, like that which we know to have taken place at a later time.¹

The agreements which I have just been discussing are for the most part individually slight and the class is not extensive. The explanations just suggested will, it seems to me, remove the necessity for the hypothesis of direct knowledge by one evangelist of the work of the other. It would be quite a different thing to offer such explanations as adequate of themselves to account for the great mass of close resemblances, amounting in some cases to identity, in the matter contained in St. Matthew and St. Luke. Yet they may rightly have the effect of modifying in some degree our view of those parallels. In particular, in many

¹ Cf. Sanday, *EXPOSITOR* for March, 1891, p. 191.

places where there was originally only general similarity, assimilation by copyists may have done the rest. For it should be noticed that this assimilation would especially go on, wherever there was already a good deal of likeness.

The points which have been considered in this paper have their independent interest. In addition to this they seem to strengthen somewhat the argument of the last paper against the supposition that St. Matthew and St. Luke used a common document. Any more direct suggestions as to the composition of these Gospels had better be reserved till after we have considered the question of the authorship of the third Gospel, which I propose to do in another paper. But before concluding this one, it will be interesting to quote the following opinion from Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to the New Testament*, "What I have said gives me occasion to remark that theories as to one of the Synoptics having copied another, seem to me deserving consideration only if we confine them to the relations of Mark to the other two, for Matthew and Luke show every sign of being quite independent of each other."¹ I understand him in the closing words to refer to the question of dependence through the use of a common document as well as to direct dependence. Such an opinion from a scholar who has shown that he has no prejudice against the belief that the Synoptists used a common written source or sources, and who holds that they had such "a common source, which is represented most fully by St. Mark,"² should certainly have weight.

V. H. STANTON

¹ *Introduction to New Testament*, 1st ed., p. 167.

² *Ib.*, p. 187.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

IV. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

IN these Epistles the controversy between Paul and his opponents takes the form of an attack and a defence of his apostolic standing, and of his personal character in connection therewith. The advocates of a Judaistic Christianity do not seem to have made in Corinth any direct attempt to induce the members of the Church to submit to the rite of circumcision, or any other part of the Jewish law, probably for the simple reason that such an attempt in that centre of Greek life would have been futile. They appear to have confined their efforts at fostering a legal temper to questions of detail, such as the eating of meats offered to idols. Amid the Greeks of Corinth, with their liberal instincts, the anti-Paulinists would be obliged to pursue their end, the destruction of a free independent Christianity, by a circuitous course. They could not, with hope of success, teach their own doctrines, but they might assail the man who taught doctrines of an opposite nature, might blacken his character, and plausibly deny, or cunningly undermine, his apostolic standing. The spirit of the people gave them a good chance of success in this bad line of action, for the Greeks in general, and the Corinthians in particular, were volatile, opinionative, addicted to party spirit, and to the faithlessness and heartlessness which that spirit usually engenders.

There is very little bearing on the great controversy to be found in the first Epistle, which treats mainly of the multifarious disorders and irregularities of the Corinthian Church, the various questions of casuistry therein debated, relating to sacrificial meats, marriage, the dress and deport-

ment of women, etc., and an eccentric opinion entertained by some concerning the resurrection. Only a few slight hints occur here and there of the presence of a hostile element bent on undermining the Apostle's influence and authority, such as the reference to the parties into which the Church was divided,¹ the allusion to some who were puffed up because they thought the Apostle was frightened to visit Corinth,² and the abrupt manner in which, in the ninth chapter, the writer, in interrogative form, asserts his apostolic dignity and privileges.³ Were it not for the prominence given to the element of self-defence in the second Epistle, one might even legitimately doubt whether these stray hints did really imply the existence in the Corinthian Church of a mischief-making Judaistic section; but in view of the peculiar contents of the later Epistle, it seems proper to attach more significance to them than we should otherwise have done. It is, of course, quite conceivable that between the writing of the first Epistle and the date of the second, a new situation had emerged, that a party of legalists had in the interval arrived on the scene and created other work for Paul than that of correcting Corinthian abuses. Thus we might explain why there is so little in the first Epistle of that which constitutes the peculiarity of the second. But the fact might be otherwise accounted for. It may be due in part to the circumstance that in his first Epistle Paul had so many urgent matters to write about, that the personal question was crowded out; in part to his adversaries not having as yet found their opportunity, so that their presence in the Church might meantime be disregarded, or alluded to only in a distant manner.

However it is to be explained, the fact certainly is, that the allusions to a hostile party in the first Epistle are very

¹ 1 Cor. i. 11, 12.

² 1 Cor. iv. 18.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 1-6.

slight and vague. What is said concerning the divisions in the Church is far from clear. How many parties were there, and what were their respective characteristics? Baur reduces them to two, a Petrine and a Pauline, the other two being varieties of these, or the same party under a different name; the Petrine party *e.g.* calling itself now after Peter the chief of the original apostles, now after Christ, to imply that in their view companionship with Jesus was an indispensable qualification for apostleship.¹ According to Holsten, those who called themselves after Christ were a distinct party, consisting of strangers who had come into the Church, men who had personally followed Jesus, belonging indeed to the Seventy, therefore claiming the title of apostles.² It is assumed by both these writers that the divisions rested on a doctrinal basis, which, however, is denied by others, who think that they amounted to little more than personal preferences.³ The whole subject is enveloped in obscurity, but the probability is that there was a Judaistic leaven in the Corinthian Church even when the first Epistle was written, as it is certain there must have been at the date of the second.

On this view we can best understand 1 Corinthians ix. 1-6, though that Paul is on his defence is far from self-evident even in this passage, especially as it stands in the correct text, according to which the question, Am I not free? comes before the question, Am I not an apostle? According to this reading the reference to the apostleship and its rights comes in simply as an illustration of the maxim previously laid down, that a Christian must sometimes deny himself the use of an undoubted liberty. The only

¹ *Vide Paulus der Apostel*, i. 291-8.

² *Vide Das Evangelium des Paulus*, pp. 196-232, where there is a very able discussion of the question, Who were the Christ party? Holsten finds the proof of his view above stated, in 2 Cor. x.-xiii., the whole of which he regards as a polemic against this party.

³ So Sabatier.

thing that makes us suspect that the Apostle has something more in his mind is the abruptness with which the reference to the apostleship comes in, and the strange emphasis with which the theme, once introduced, is insisted on. While ostensibly only illustrating a general doctrine concerning Christian liberty, he drags the apostleship into the discussion as if desirous to speak of it for its own sake, and he makes statements regarding it which seem irrelevant to the previous connection of thought, in a tone that nothing going before accounts for. "Have I not seen the Lord Jesus? Are not ye my work in the Lord? If I be not an apostle to others, yet at least I am to you, for the seal of my apostleship are ye in the Lord." Why such questions and assertions, unless some were calling in question his claim to be an apostle?

Statements introduced in this indirect passing manner, could not satisfactorily dispose of the subject to which they referred. Nevertheless, in the light of the ampler treatment in the second Epistle, one can discover in the ninth chapter of the first the leading points of Paul's apology for his assailed apostolic standing. I am an apostle, he says in effect, because (1) I have seen the Lord,¹ (2) I have been signally successful in my preaching,² (3) I have endured hardship in the cause. The hardship he has in view is the obligation imposed on him by the state of feeling in the Church to refuse support and to work for his own livelihood.³ Now when we pass to the second Epistle we find that what Paul there says on the same topic amounts simply to an expansion of these three arguments.

In proceeding to consider the eloquent and triumphant apologetic of that Epistle I begin by remarking that the whole defence rests on the general axiom that the quali-

¹ 1 Cor. ix. 1.

² 1 Cor. ix. 2.

³ 1 Cor. ix. 7-12.

fications for the Christian apostleship are spiritual, not technical. In this respect there is a close resemblance between Paul's argument in defence of his apostolic standing and the argument of the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in defence of the priesthood of Christ. In both cases the presumption from a legal point of view was against the position defended. Christ possessed none of the legal qualifications for the priesthood. In like manner Paul's qualification for the apostleship might well appear questionable. He had not been one of the companions of Jesus. On a *primâ facie* view, that was a grave defect in his title; for not to Judaistic prejudice alone, but to right reason it could not but appear important that the authoritative teachers of Christianity should be able to say from their own knowledge, "thus spake and acted the Lord Jesus." It is indeed obvious that, as eye-witnesses of Christ's personal ministry, the eleven were authorities in a sense in which Paul could not pretend to be authoritative. But how then does he vindicate his claim to rank with the Eleven as an apostle? Let us see.

1. His first line of defence is that *he has seen the Lord*. "Have I not seen Jesus our Lord?" asks he in the first Epistle, alluding primarily to the vision on the way to Damascus, but not to that alone, or perhaps even chiefly, as we can gather from various texts in the second Epistle. He lays chief stress, in reality, on the vision of Jesus with the eye of the spirit, the insight he has gained into the true meaning of Christ's whole earthly history. Sufficient vouchers for this statement may be found in 2 Corinthians iii. 18, and iv. 6, which tell of the writer's unveiled view of the glory of the Lord, and of an inward illumination granted to him worthy to be compared to the illumination of the world when God uttered the creative fiat: Let there be light. Paul's contention, virtually, is that the vision of the spirit is more important than the vision of the bodily

eye; that indeed the latter without the former possesses no value. His tacit assumption is that the vision of the spirit is possible without the vision of the eye, and that there may be a vision of the eye unaccompanied by the vision of the spirit. If these positions be admitted, then there is no reason why a Paul should be behind the chiefest of the apostles. In matters of fact pertaining to the life of Jesus, their testimony, of course, possessed unique authority. But were they necessarily entitled to speak with exclusive or even superior authority as to the religious significance of the facts? Their claim to be heard there would depend on the measure of their spiritual illumination. But the question between Paul and his opponents was precisely this: Who is the most authoritative and reliable interpreter of Christ's mind? It was not, who is most likely to know the facts, but who best understands the facts. And Paul's claim was that he possessed an understanding of the facts at least equal to that of the eleven. And to that claim it would have been an utter irrelevance to have objected: Ah, but you never were a companion of the Lord like Cephas. It would have been an irrelevance of the same kind as it would be to say to a man of genius, "It is impossible you can be a great poet, for your father was not a man of wealth or of rank." It would have been to lay stress on what was at best a matter of prestige, in a spirit of vulgar worldliness; in Paul's own words, to make knowledge of Jesus *after the flesh*¹ the one thing needful. It would have been, in short, to make the definition of apostleship turn upon something outward, in which case Paul could only make his opponents welcome to the name, and claim for himself the substance, the right, viz., to come before the world as an independent interpreter of the Christian religion.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 16.

But does Paul's argument not prove too much? On naturalistic principles it certainly does. The scope of his argument, interpreted by naturalism, is, "Every man an apostle who has spiritual insight, Luther not less than Paul. No man an absolute authority in matters of faith, not Paul any more than Luther, but each man authoritative according to the measure of his light." Paul did not mean to go this length. He regarded the apostles as exceptional characters, not merely in view of the measure of their inspiration, but because they were eye-witnesses of the resurrection. Hence the stress which he lays on the fact of having himself seen Jesus, not only in 1 Corinthians ix., but also in the fifteenth chapter of the same Epistle, where he enumerates the appearances of the risen Christ. He was not wrong in attaching importance to that fact in connection with the vindication of his apostleship. For no one who believed that the alleged appearance of Jesus to the persecutor on the way to Damascus was a reality, would be disposed to deny that its final cause was to convert a bitter enemy of the faith into a divinely commissioned preacher of it. Of course it was open to Paul's opponents to deny the reality of his vision; probably they did deny it, resolving the event into a purely subjective impression, as was done in later days, in writings of intensely anti-Pauline bias like the Clementines. But they could not well admit the objectivity of the Christophany, and deny the inference to apostolic vocation.

2. The second line of defence is *success in the work of the apostleship*. Paul says much of his success as an apostle to the Gentiles, and that not merely by way of stating facts, still less in a spirit of idle boasting, but consciously and seriously in the way of argument and self-defence; as if to say, "Providence has set its seal upon my ministry." He hints at this part of his apology in the first Epistle, as when he says to the Corinthians, "If to others I am not an

apostle, yet at least I am to you, for the seal of mine apostleship are ye in the Lord"; and again when he writes, "By the grace of God I am what I am; and His grace which was bestowed upon me was not found vain, but I laboured more abundantly than they all."¹ But it is in the second Epistle that he develops the argument so as to do it full justice. It is the main theme of the remarkable passage beginning at chapter ii. verse 14, and extending to the end of the third chapter.² The argument worthily opens with the words, "Now thanks be to God who causeth us ever to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest by us the savour of His knowledge in every place."³ They are in the heroic style, and suggest the idea of a great victorious general receiving a triumphal entry into the city in honour of his victories, followed by a train of captives marching towards their fate, some to deliverance and some to death. It looks like boasting, but it is boasting in self-defence; therefore, though conscious, and frankly owning, that he is using language of self-commendation, he yet boldly employs it; and to make the argument from success more telling he gives it a personal turn by appealing to the effect of his work among

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 10.

² We might even include in this section chapter iv. 1-6.

³ 2 Cor. ii. 14. The word *θριαμβέοντι* has caused much trouble to interpreters. I retain the rendering of the A.V. as best suited to the connection of thought, though recent writers, while admitting its suitability, reject it as contrary to usage. That similar verbs are sometimes used in a *factitive* sense is not denied (e.g. *βασιλεύειν*, 1 Sam. viii. 22), but it is contended that *θριαμβέειν* is never used in this sense, but only in the sense of triumphing over one, as in Colossians ii. 15, the only other instance of its use in the New Testament. But the basis of induction is narrow, and the question is just whether the connection does not justify us in finding an instance of the factitive use here. In any case we must think of Paul as sharing the triumph of God, not as triumphed over; as at least an incense bearer, not as a captive (*vide* the translation of the passage in *the Scripture for Young Readers*, 1892). I cannot close this note without referring to Professor Findlay's article on the word in *THE EXPOSITOR* for December, 1879, in which he ably contends for the Greek sense as distinct from the Roman, according to which the reference is not to a military triumph but to a sacred procession of enthusiastic worshippers led by the inspiring God. The stress on this view lies on the Apostle's *enthusiasm*, not on his success.

the Corinthians themselves. "Are we beginning again to commend ourselves, or need we, as do certain persons, epistles of commendation to you or from you? Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read by all men."¹ The certain persons referred to are of course legalist opponents, whose manner of action Paul loses no opportunity of contrasting with his own. They brought letters of introduction from influential men, coming not to preach the Gospel but to neutralise his influence. He needed no such letters, at least among Corinthians; the success of his labours, as evidenced by their renewed hearts, was all the commendation he required.

The apostle would have the Corinthians carefully consider what this success meant, and takes pains in the sequel to make them understand its significance. It was, he tells them, a proof of sufficiency or fitness for the work. For when he asked, "Who is sufficient or fit for such a ministry?"² he did not mean to suggest that no one was. He himself claimed to possess the necessary aptitude. He disclaimed only a sufficiency self-originated. He devoutly ascribed his sufficiency to God; and just on that account he assigned to it very great significance, as revealing a Divine purpose. When God fits a man for a work He calls him to the work, such is the Apostle's argument. Drawn out in full his logic is to this effect: It is not an accident that a man succeeds in the work I have on hand. Success proves fitness, and fitness in turn proves Divine vocation.

One would like to know how Paul defined sufficiency. He has anticipated our wish and given a full satisfactory answer to our question. The gist of his answer is that sufficiency or fitness for Christian apostleship consists in insight into, and thorough sympathy with, the genius of the Christian religion. Thus the second line of defence runs up

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 1, 2.

² 2 Cor. ii. 13.

into the first ; brilliant success springing out of clear vision. The sentences in which the Apostle gives practical proof of his insight and appreciation form one of the golden utterances of this Epistle.¹ It is the one passage in the two Epistles to the Corinthian Church kindred in its doctrinal drift to the teaching of the Epistles to the Galatian and Roman Churches concerning the law. It is a two-edged sword which may be used either for defence of Paul's apostleship, or in defence of his conception of Christianity. If his apostleship be admitted, then we have here an authoritative exposition of the nature of Christianity. If the correctness of the exposition be conceded, then it makes for Paul's apostleship, for he certainly possessed qualities fitting him in a peculiar degree to be the propagator of such a religion. Paul's own mind seems to oscillate between the two lines of inference. At first the apologetic interest seems to be in the ascendant ; but when he has once entered on a description of the economy whereof he claims to be a fit minister, he forgets himself, and launches out into an enthusiastic eulogium of New Testament religion, as the religion of the *spirit*, of *life*, and of *righteousness*, as opposed to legalism, the religion of the letter, of death, and of condemnation, so giving us an utterance not merely serving a temporary apologetic purpose, but of permanent didactic value. Whatever impression it made on the Corinthian Church, it leaves no doubt in our minds as to Paul's peculiar fitness to be an apostle of the Christian faith. Who so fit to propagate the religion of the spirit, of life, and of justification by faith, as the man who had by bitter experience proved legalism to be indeed a religion of condemnation and death, and to whom Christianity had come as a veritable year of jubilee, proclaiming liberty to the captives and the opening of prison doors to them that are bound? Of this experience, however, the Apostle *says* nothing here, though

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 6-11.

doubtless he thinks of it as he writes. It suits his purpose rather to refer to another element of sufficiency, *straight-forward sincerity*, standing in contrast as it does to the double dealing of his opponents. His argument now takes this turn. The religion of spirit and life, eternal because perfect,¹ has nothing to hide; the better it is known the more acceptable it will be; it is only the religion of written rules, and legal bondage, and fear, that needs a veil to cover its inherent defects. I therefore am congenially outspoken, as becomes the servant of a religion, not of mystery, but of light, bright and glorious as the sun. I am not one of your huckstering merchants who adulterate their wares.² I convey the truth in Jesus, in its simplicity and purity, from land to land; in this differing from my opponents, who mix gospel and law to the injury of their customers. Not only am I sincere, speaking nothing but the truth, but I am frank, speaking the whole truth, herein differing even from Moses, who put a veil on his face. At this point Paul may appear to lapse into a Rabbinical way of thinking, but the thought wrapped up in his allegory of the veil is clear, and as precious as it is clear. The law did not announce its own transitoriness; it could not afford to do so. It had to practise reserve to uphold its authority. If it had said plainly, I am for a time, I am but a means to an end, it would have encouraged disrespect for its requirements. Therefore, just because it was a defective religion it had to be a religion of mystery. Christianity, on the other hand, needs no such veil; the more plainly its ministers speak the better. The frank man is the fit man, the most successful, the God-appointed.

3. But the treasure is in a fragile earthen vessel,³ and that may seem to detract from the fitness. Far from admitting

¹ 2 Cor. iii. 11.

² 2 Cor. ii. 17: *καπηλεύοντες*, another of Paul's strong graphic words in this context, found here only in the New Testament.

³ 2 Cor. iv. 7.

that it does, however, Paul rather insists on the fact as a third argument in support of his claim to be an Apostle. "I have," he says in effect, "earned the right to be regarded as the Apostle of the Gentiles by manifold sufferings endured in connexion with my work." He has already used this argument in his Epistle to the Galatians, expressing it in these pathetic terms: "Henceforth let no man trouble me, for I bear branded on my body the marks of Jesus."¹ The words, as Hausrath finely remarks, suggest the picture of an old general who bares his breast before his rebellious legions, and shows them the wound-prints which prove that he is not unworthy to be called their commander.² The Apostle resumes the plea and urges it with great force and with much iteration, in the Epistle now under consideration, the passages in which it recurs rising to the dignity and grandeur of the greatest utterances to be found within the whole range of tragic poetry, and constituting together what might not unfitly be called the "Pauline Iliad." The first of these impassioned outbursts begins at chapter iv. ver. 7, and, running through a series of bold paradoxes, ends by comparing the life of the writer to a slow, cruel crucifixion, or to a continual descent from the cross.³ The Apostle returns to the theme again in the sixth chapter, this time entering much more into detail. Appealing to the Corinthians to see to it that they receive not in vain the message of reconciliation so earnestly delivered by his lips, he backs up the appeal by a reference to those manifold sufferings which at once gave him a claim on their consideration, and commended him as a true Apostle.⁴ In a third passage of similar character, in the

¹ Gal. vi. 17.

² *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. ii., p. 584.

³ So Stanley (*St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians*), who takes *véκρωσις* to mean not "dying" nor "death," but "deadness." "It is as if he had said, We are living corpses. It is a continual 'Descent from the Cross.'" "

⁴ 2 Cor. vi. 5-10.

eleventh chapter,¹ he reaches the climax of his argument from tribulation, taking occasion there to mention some particulars in his history not elsewhere alluded to, one being that five times he had received from the Jews forty stripes save one.² He is not ashamed to mention such ignominious facts, he rather glories in them, because they all tend to vindicate his claim to be the divinely-commissioned Apostle of the Gentiles. It is even possible that in enduring such evil treatment at the hands of the Jews, he was glad to have an opportunity of bearing for Christ's sake what he had made others bear, as a sort of atonement for past sin.

The chapter from which the last citation is made is one of four (chaps. x.-xiii.), which are distinguished from the rest of the Epistle by a bitterly controversial tone. The difference is so marked as to have suggested the idea that they originally formed a distinct letter, the very letter indeed referred to in 2 Corinthians vii. 8, which is there spoken of as having by its severity deeply wounded the feelings of the Corinthian Church. The suggestion, though not without plausibility, is not hastily to be adopted. The diversity between the two parts of the Epistle can easily be reconciled with its unity by the supposition that in the earlier part the Apostle has in his view mainly the faithful majority in the Corinthian Church who had supported his authority in the case of discipline, and were generally friendly to him, and that after he had written what he had to say to them in a tone of gentleness, he turned his thoughts to the minority and the men by whose malign influence they had been misled, and dealt with them as they deserved, with a rod rather than in a spirit of meekness.³

¹ 2 Cor. xi. 23-33.

² 2 Cor. xi. 24.

³ Heinrici (*Das zweite Sendschreiben des Apostel Paulus an die Korinthier*, 1887) points out that if the Epistle had ended with the details about the col-

These four chapters contain copious materials bearing on all the three branches of Paul's argument in defence of his Apostleship. To the first head, the argument from insight, belongs chapter xii. 1-6, where he boasts of the visions and revelations he had enjoyed more than fourteen years previous to the date of the Epistle, that is about the time of his conversion. To the second head, the argument from success, belongs chapter x. 12-18, where the Apostle refers to the wide area over which his missionary labours had extended. It is noticeable that he emphasises the *pioneering* character of his work not less than its extent; here again, as in so many other connexions, with an eye to the contrasted conduct of his opponents. They could point to no churches founded by their efforts; but only to churches already established which they had sought to disturb and corrupt by their sectarian animosities and legalist doctrines. He, on the other hand, had never entered on another man's province, taking up work already begun, either to further or to mar it, but had always broken new ground. Which of the two modes of action was most worthy of an Apostle he would leave them to judge. To the third head, the argument from suffering, belong, over and above the passages already cited containing the long catalogue of woes, all the places in which Paul alludes to his refusal to receive from the Church of Corinth any contributions towards his maintenance. His adversaries appear to have put a sinister construction on this refusal, suggesting that it sprang from his not feeling quite sure of his ground. "He calls himself an Apostle," so they seem to have argued, "why then does he not use his privilege as an Apostle, and claim maintenance from his converts like the other apostles? Evidently it is because he is afraid lest his pretensions should

lection for the poor in chapter ix., it would have been a fragment, and that chapters x.-xiii. were necessary to explain and justify the hard judgments incidentally pronounced in the earlier chapters on the character of the Judaists.

not be recognised." Thoroughly selfish themselves, these base-minded men could not so much as imagine the generous motives by which Paul was really actuated. They took for granted that he would be glad to get money from all the Churches if he could. They seem even to have gone the length of insinuating that he did get it in a round-about way; that in fact that collection for the poor in Palestine, which he was always making such a fuss about, was merely a scheme for getting money into his own pocket while pretending to be very independent. Such seems to be the plain sense of chapter xii. 16-18, the first sentence giving the substance of what Paul's enemies said of him and some members of the Corinthian Church were base enough to believe. "He does not burden us with his maintenance: no, not directly; but he is crafty, catches us with guile, in connexion with that collection." Feeling keenly the humiliation of being obliged to answer such a charge, Paul replies: "Did I make gain of you by any of them whom I sent unto you? I asked Titus to go, and I sent with him the brother. Did Titus overreach you? Walked we not in the same spirit, in the same steps?" The Apostle's true motive in the whole matter of his support was a noble spirit of self-sacrifice, which, itself divine, was a sure mark that his mission was from God. The suggestion of his enemies, that if he were sure of his apostolic standing he would demand a maintenance, resembled Satan's suggestion to Jesus: if thou be the Son of God command that these stones be made bread. If thou be an Apostle, said these children of Satan, command the Churches to support thee. But the reasoning was as inconclusive in the one case as in the other. Jesus showed Himself to be the Son of God just by refusing to turn His Sonship to His own advantage. Paul showed himself to be an Apostle of God by refusing with equal steadfastness to set his personal interests above the public interests of

the Divine Kingdom. Though he was an Apostle he was willing to suffer in every way, and by that will to suffer for God's glory and man's good, he gave the most convincing evidence that he was a true Apostle; not one who arrogated the dignity to himself, but called of God thereunto.

In the foregoing statement we have been occupied exclusively with those parts of the two Epistles which bear on the question of the Apostleship, and have met with little that throws light on Paul's conception of Christianity. The doctrinal element is indeed not abundant even for one who is in quest of it. It is however not altogether wanting. Besides the important passage already referred to exhibiting a contrast between the legal and the Christian dispensations, the second Epistle contains two striking *logia* bearing on the significance of Christ's death. These are, "If one died for all, then all died,"¹ and, "Him who knew not sin, He made sin on our behalf that we might become the righteousness of God in Him."² These great Pauline words show two complementary aspects of the Apostle's doctrine of the Atonement. The first Epistle contains, in the eighth and fifteenth chapters, important contributions to the doctrine of Christ's Person.

A. B. BRUCE.

¹ 2 Cor. v. 14.

² 2 Cor. v. 21.

EXEGETIC STUDIES ON THE LORD'S PRAYER.

II.

IN my previous paper, after trying to give fresh force to the immeasurable importance of the fact that the Son of God should Himself have taught us how, and even in what words, to address His Father in heaven, I spoke of the simplicity, the brevity, the directness of the Lord's Prayer, and its infinite adaptability to all human needs. I will now point out some of the lessons of its structure, and the deep spirituality which differentiates it from all human prayers. I said that if the Lord's Prayer be indeed of so divine an origin, it must justify its origin by its absolute perfectness and flawless inspiration. The more we study it the more, I am convinced, shall we see that this is indeed the case.

I. Let us first notice the lessons which lie not only in the pregnant conciseness but also in the perfect symmetry of its structure.

The Lord's Prayer consists of an address to God, of seven petitions, and of a doxology.

1. Of the doxology we need not now speak. It is beyond all question a liturgical accretion, desirable, scriptural, full of value and appropriateness, but attached to the prayer by the spontaneous impulse of the Church for Eucharistic use, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit of God. It is absent from the Prayer, as recorded in the Gospel of St. Luke, and was almost certainly an addition to the original text of St. Matthew also. It is found in various forms; is based on Old Testament analogies; and was used, now in one now in another form, in the earliest documents of the Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic Church. "From the first," says Mr. Chase, in his valuable monograph¹ on *The Lord's Prayer in the Early Church*, "like other prayers, it had

¹ *Texts and Studies*, Cambridge, 1891.

attached to it now one doxology now another. The Lord's Prayer was (as the *Didaché* seems to suggest) in this way frequently adapted for use at the Service of Holy Communion; and finally one form of doxology, which appears to be a conflation of two distinct forms, was added to the Prayer in the 'Syrian' text of St. Matthew's Gospel, and so has remained the common conclusions of the Prayer since the fourth century."

2. But though it is now admitted that the Doxology formed no part of the structure of the Lord's Prayer as originally delivered, some may hold that the body of the prayer consists of *six*, not of seven clauses. They will take the view which many have taken, and among these Archbishop Leighton, that the words, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil" do not constitute two clauses, but one, of which the second half is only an epexegetis of the first. I cannot now pause to prove that this is an error, and that the clause, "deliver us from the evil one"—for such is almost certainly the exact meaning of the last petition—is separate from the previous clause,¹ and comprehensively sums up the entire Prayer, of which it is indeed the universal climax. But were this a matter of uncertainty in other respects, the symmetry of *seven* petitions would have some weight in turning the balance. Material and practical ages, and that attitude of the Western mind which makes it usually indifferent to, and even contemptuous of anything which bears upon a mysticism which is to it unintelligible, may regard this

¹ "There are that make but six petitions of this prayer, saying that the two last are but one; but they have no warrant for it. The Ancient Church hath always divided it into seven; in this division they grounded upon the motive which caused our Saviour Christ to pen (*sic*) this prayer, which was the avoiding of that *παντολογία* used by the heathen, into which they cannot choose but fall, which affirm that these two last petitions contain but one thing; wherein they are deceived, for temptations and evil are not of one scantling. Every evil is not temptation, neither is every temptation evil."—Bishop Andrewes, *The Lord's Prayer*, Sermon xvii., *opp.* v. 449.

symmetry as insignificant. It would have been far otherwise with Jews and Easterns in general. With them considerations of rhythm and number entered largely into sacred things. In the poetry of the Old Testament the form is repeatedly dependent on numerical arrangements which involved a deep symbolism. The Hebrews attached a mystic importance even to the physiological qualities of sound. In their view of the nature of language they were analogists not anomalists—in other words they held that names originated by nature (*φύσει*), not by convention (*θέσει συνθήκη*), and that their form and significance were determined by some inward necessity, not by arbitrary caprice. Similarly they attached a deep importance to numbers. Any one who will study the details of Solomon's Temple, or its ideal reconstruction by the Prophet Ezekiel, will see that the minutest details were determined by the sacredness and significance of particular numbers. The sense of this sacredness continued through the Middle Ages. Why is the number Three impressed on Westminster Abbey, and all our great minsters in the triple height, and length, and breadth, as it was also impressed on the Jewish Temple, except because the number Three is the signature of the Divine? Why does the number Seven dominate in the arrangement of the pillars, except with reference to "Wisdom hath builded her house, she hath hewn out her seven pillars"? Why did Dante not think it unimportant to invent for his Divine Comedy the *terza rima*, and divide his poem into three parts, of which each contains 33 cantos? The numbers 3 and 7 are stamped with the signature of Godhead and of God's relation to man. The number 3, as explained by Bähr, the chief modern student of the symbolism of numbers, expresses "the concrete and perfect unity resulting from the reconciliation of difference and opposition." Four is "the number of the world, the sum of all created things, and of Divine revelation."

The number 7, according to the same authority, being the sum of 3 + 4, stands, according to the hidden properties of numbers, for "the combination of God and the world." Whatever may be thought of this, it is certain from endless instances in the Bible that the Jews attached to the number Seven a peculiar sanctity and meaning. "It was considered," says Kalisch, "as the number of combination and connection, of unity and harmony, of salvation and blessing, of peace and sanctification, of the covenant between God and Israel (and therefore in some respects as the theocratical number), of expiation and atonement, of purification and initiation."¹ It was, whether from astronomical or other reasons, also regarded as mystic by the Greeks and Romans. "Septem," says Cicero, "*qui rerum fere omnium modus est.*"² "Pleraque cœlestium," says Tacitus, "*vim suam et cursum septimos per numeros conficiunt.*"³ The Lord's Prayer fell naturally into 7 petitions, and in impressing this number upon it, and in giving it this form, our Lord lent it an additional solemnity to the Eastern Churches, among which the Gospel was first established. Nor is the fact unworthy of notice that the first *three* petitions refer directly to the glory of God, and the last *four* to the needs of man.

3. The Lord's Prayer would not be Divine if it were not Catholic in the true sense of universal charity, universal comprehensiveness, universal adaptation to the yearnings of every soul, of every creed, which longs and thirsts for God and for righteousness, as the hart panteth after the waterbrooks. In this sense it is the Divine presentation of true religion. What is religion? The word has received many definitions. Plato called it "a likeness to God, according to our ability"; John Smith, "the seed of God

¹ On Exodus, p. 449.

² Cic., *Somnium Scipionis ad init.*

³ Tac., *Hist.* v. 4; comp. Plin., *H. N.*, xi. 43.

in the spirits of men"; Schelling, "the union of the finite with the Infinite."¹ Kant was very near the mark when he saw the essence of religion in obedience to the categorical imperative; and Jeremy Taylor, when he defined it as "the whole duty of man, comprehending in it justice, charity, and sobriety."

But no better definition was ever given of religion than that given by the great and strong thinker, Benjamin Whichcote, when he wrote "religion means a good heart and a good life." All the deepest and loftiest parts of the Divine teaching in Scripture seem intended to warn us of the errors which confuse religion pure and undefiled with the acceptance of elaborate theologies, the membership of exclusive organisations, or adherence to what is claimed as the only orthodoxy in matters of opinion respecting which Christians differ. The one lesson impressed upon us from the beginning to the end of the Bible, and with strongest emphasis in its most glorious passages, is that the only tests of religion which are of the least value are right conduct and holy character. All else will vanish, this will remain. Of the many lies which "God's infinite and fiery finger" will shrivel from the souls of men, the most numerous, and among the most deleterious, will be all sorts of religious shams, unrealities, human systems, shibboleths, and commandments, which priests have added to the pure truth of the Gospel. Says Dr. Oliver W. Holmes, "Men are tattooed with their special beliefs like so many South Sea Islanders; but a real human heart, with Divine Love in it, beats with the same glow under all the patterns of all earth's thousand tribes." Turn the pages of religious controversy, teeming as they do to this day with the poisonous fruits of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, and in proportion as they claim to be the defence and representation of the sole truth of religion,

¹ See Parker, *Discourse of Religion*, p. 27.

they will at once be seen to abound in the glossy leaves of arrogant Pharisaism, which are not for the healing but for the embitterment of the nations. The only genuine fruits of the Tree of Life are love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance. These do not result from the acceptance of all the finely-articulated dogmas and yokes of bondage which ambitious priests and erring Churches have imposed on the free neck of Christendom, but on the faith in Christ, and the union with Christ. It is this faith which issues in obedience to the Ten Words which constitute the old, simple, majestic Voice of Sinai. The Law alone carries with it no power to secure our obedience; Christ came to deliver us by His Gospel from the curse of the Law. On the two Commandments—Love God with all thy heart, and Love thy neighbour as thyself—hang all the Law and the Prophets. The possibility of obeying the Second Commandment depends solely on obedience to the First. The possibility of obeying the first depends on the forgiveness which Christ has procured for us, and the strength and faithfulness which He inspires. The means whereby we can avail ourselves of this Heavenly Grace is Prayer; and I see at once on the Lord's Prayer the stamp of its Divine origin when I see that it indicates only the Eternal essentials of true religion, and excludes everything which is either in its essence anti-religious, or, at the best (to use the phrase of Hillel) "only commentary and fringe."

4. There is another most divine element in this prayer besides this catholicity which makes it equally precious to all of every fold, who, with whatever differences, love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity and truth. It is the unapproachable spirituality of the teaching which it involves.

This is observable in the very first petition. I think that if we would confess the honest truth, many—perhaps all except the maturest saints of God—would admit that of

all the petitions the one which least comes home to them, the one which seems to them the most vague and the least real, is the first. Yet would our Lord have made room for it, much more would He have put it in the very forefront, though He had just been uttering the strongest warnings against artificial and vain petitions, if it had not been of supreme importance, and if He had not intended it to lead the way into the innermost shrine of all true prayer? As the first star is the most lustrous of all the night—

“Hesperus, that led
The starry train, rode brightest”—

so may not this petition be in some sense the brightest of all—the most radiant in this Pleiad of seven petitions?

5. What we are too apt to overlook in offering the Lord's Prayer is its direct and divine *instructiveness*; the illuminating light which it flings upon the nature of God and our relation to Him. The very fact that this petition—“hallowed be Thy name”—is about the last we should have thought of enshrining in our supplications to Heaven, is a measure of its necessity. If the plural “our” instead of the singular “my” in the first word of the prayer, and throughout it, was meant to teach us the duty of unselfishness; this petition “Hallowed be Thy name” was meant to go farther and deeper, and to teach not only unselfishness but *self-forgetfulness*—self-annihilation, so far as self is at enmity with God. It wields the axe against the root of that love of self from which springs every form of rebellion and wickedness. It points to the absorption, the annihilation of self in God. It teaches us, and with all the more force because so indirectly, that no man liveth to himself and no man dieth to himself, but that man's chief end is “to glorify God here,” and “enjoy Him for ever in heaven hereafter.”

6. This lesson, this characteristic, is woven into the very

tissue and essence of the prayer, because no lesson is more intensely needful. The form which our prayers tend to assume is that poor bargaining of the yet imperfect Patriarch. "If thou wilt give me bread to eat and raiment to put on . . . THEN shall the Lord be my God." Sometimes it fatally resembles the mean cry of the poor Mohammedan, "Oh, Allah, I want a hundred sequins, give me a hundred sequins, just a hundred sequins. O Allah, all I ask of Thee is a hundred sequins—neither more nor less." The only one of the seven petitions with which the carnal mind has much affinity is "Give us this day our daily bread"; and even that it despises as scanty and insufficient, unless it can alter the form from the plural to the singular, exclude from it every spiritual element, and make daily bread include the comforts, riches, and luxuries of life. It is not only the ignorant heathen who are ever pestering God with selfish and unseemly desires, like worthless vagrants who burst with their mendicancy into the presence of a king. Perhaps there may be not a few who, with slight disguises, and in the secret back chambers of their being, offer positively wicked prayers like—

"Pulchra Laverna,
Da mihi fallere da justo sancto videri;
Noctem peccatis et fraudibus objice nubem"—¹

or like Saul's request to Samuel to honour him before the elders of the people though he had sinned; or like the prayer which the unconverted Augustine offered against the lusts of his youth with the secret reservation of a hope that God would allow him to indulge himself in them a little longer; or like that in the heart of the adulterous murderer in the great tragedy that he might be pardoned, and yet retain the offence; or like that of the Indian Thug that he may murder more victims as a sacrifice to his goddess; or

¹ Hor., *Epp.*, I. xvi. v. 6.

that of the Italian brigand to the Virgin for the success of his raid. Perhaps our prayers are not often so desperately evil as this, because we cannot but feel that "If I incline to wickedness in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." But how often do they abound in the kind of personal beggary which Christ discourages as the degradation of all prayer. So that as the very initial lesson of all prayer He teaches us to "seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness," and all other needful things will be added unto us. He utterly discountenances the putting of our miserable selves, and of our own mean desires, into the forefront. He teaches us how deadly is the egotism which makes us treat our own small individuality as the sole centre of our own universe. He teaches us that the moral and spiritual order of the only life which is true life rolls round Him the risen Sun of righteousness. He teaches us that the one object of prayer is "to *become* and not to *get*"; and if we would but print deep upon our hearts the truth that the type of all acceptable prayer is not the "Give, give," of the daughters of the horseleech, but, "Hallowed be Thy name," neither our lives nor our prayers would be so poor.

7. This lesson of the spirituality of prayer—this lesson that there is no real life for man save the life of his spirit, and that there can be no life of his spirit save in God, is so completely the Alpha and Omega of this prayer that we shall see more of the truth hereafter. But we should notice how divinely the inestimable boon of prayer is thus safeguarded not only from wicked, futile, and selfish prayers, but even from too wilful an insistence on prayers which might seem innocent and natural, and yet might prove to be in their issue ruinous. For the better heathen knew as well as we do that prayers urged upon God with too unwise and wilful an importunity may prove to be dangerous things. The English poetess writes—

“God answers sharp and sudden on some prayers,
And flings the thing we have asked for in our face,
A gauntlet with a gift in it.”

Our great dramatist teaches us that—

“We, ignorant of ourselves,
Beg often our own harms, which the wise gods
Deny us for our good; so find we profit
By losing of our prayers”;

Pope tells us of—

“Atossa, cursed by many a granted prayer”;

But we read also in Vergil—

“Evertere domos totas optantibus ipsis
Di faciles”;

and in Juvenal—

“Si consilium vis
Permites ipsis expendere numinibus quid
Conveniat nobis rebusque sit utile nostris,
Nam pro jucundis, aptissima quæque dabunt Di,
Carior est illis homo quam sibi.”¹

The hymnist is but versifying sentences of Plato and of Menander when he writes—

“Not what we *wish*, but what we *want*,
Thy bounteous grace supply,
The good unasked in mercy grant,
The ill, though asked, deny.”²

But from the perils of all such earthly ignorance we shall be saved if we learn the spirit of the Lord's Prayer; for there while man's earthly needs are recognised in their

¹ *Juv. Sat.*, x. 346-349. Comp. the opinion of Socrates, who “nihil ultra petendum a Diis immortalibus arbitrabatur, quam ut bona tribuerent, quia ii demum scirent quid unicuique esset utile.” Val. Max., vii. 2. Xen., *Mem.*, i. 3, § 2.

² Ζεῦ βασιλεῦ τὰ μὲν ἐσθλὰ καὶ εὐξαμένοις καὶ ἀνεύκτοις
“Ἄμμυ δίδου, τὰ δὲ δεῖνὰ καὶ εὐχομένοις ἀπαλέξειν.

Plat., *Alc.*, ii. p. 143.

μὴ μοι γένοιθ' ἃ βούλομαι ἄλλ' ἃ συμφέρει.

Menand., *Sent.*, 336.

simplest and most comprehensive form, and his spiritual needs are more expressly pleaded, he is taught that both must be subordinated to the higher, deeper, more universal interests of all created Beings, and are therefore absorbed and overshadowed by the Eternity and Incomprehensibility of the Divine. The lesson of life is learnt in its most perfect form when we can say with all our hearts, "Whom have I in heaven but Thee? and there is none upon earth that I desire in comparison with Thee." St. Thomas Aquinas showed how well he had learnt this lesson, when to the question of the Vision of Christ, "Thou hast written well of Me, O Thomas, what reward dost thou desire?" he meekly answered, "*Non aliam mercedem nisi Te, Domine.*" The cry of the whole Lord's prayer is, O Lord, fill us out of Thy fulness; fill us with Thyself.

"Who hath this he hath all things having nought,
Who hath it not hath nothing having all."

It is the truth which has been so finely expressed by Mr. J. R. Lowell:

"Twere glorious, no doubt, to be
One of the strong-winged Hierarchy,
To burn with Seraphs, or to shine
With Cherubs, deathlessly divine;
Yet I, perhaps, poor earthly clod,
Could I forget myself in God,
Could I but find my nature's clew
Simply as birds and blossoms do,
And but for one rapt moment know
'Tis Heaven must come not we must go,
Should win my place as near the throne
As the pearl angel of its zone,
And God would listen 'mid the throng
For my one breath of perfect song,
That in its simple human way
Said all the Host of Heaven could say."

F. W. FARRAR.

DIVORCE AND CHILDHOOD.

A READING OF ST. MATT. XIX. 3-15.

OUR Lord's doctrine of divorce in St. Matthew xix. is immediately followed by His benediction on childhood. These two incidents are given in St. Mark x. in the same close order, though St. Luke has disjoined them. The object of this paper is to trace the thread of their connection, and to show how their sequence explains the attitude of the disciples to the children, and makes the whole scene instinct with reality.

It is well known that what Milton called "the doctrine and discipline of divorce" was a disputed question among Jewish teachers. Their standard precept on the subject in Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-4 was quite vague enough to invite controversy; it does not attempt to define the "unseemly thing" which is to justify a husband in putting away his wife. Here was work for commentators, and we are prepared to find that Hillel and Shammai were in direct conflict on this, as on nearly every other moot point of Jewish law. Shammai restricted divorce rigidly to the case of adultery. Hillel and his followers allowed far greater freedom. A man may divorce his wife, they said, if he hates her; if she cooks badly; if she goes abroad unveiled; if she reveals family secrets; R. Akiba even says, "if he sees some one handsomer, for it is written 'if she hath found no favour in his eyes.'"

Now, after we allow for some extravagance of Rabbinic paradox, such dicta as these illustrate the conclusion that, "according to the Rabbis, divorce was allowable for any and every cause."¹ And without pressing such doctrines to their extreme logical issue, we can understand that, en-

¹ Prof. W. H. Bennett, *The Mishna and the Gospels*, chap. 6.

dorsed by leading religious teachers, they could not fail to encourage popular license in a matter on which popular opinion is naturally lax enough. Contemporary practice in Palestine on this point was "far more in harmony with the practice of certain American States than with the teaching of Christ." The evidence shows that divorce was fatally easy, and correspondingly frequent. Remarriage of divorced persons is referred to as a matter of course.

Josephus, for instance, in his *Autobiography*, § 75, relates how, at Vespasian's command, he married a captive virgin; "yet," he adds, "she did not live with me long, but was divorced upon my going to Alexandria. However I married another wife in Alexandria." And then in § 76 he continues, "About this time I divorced my wife also (*i.e.* this second wife), as not pleased with her behaviour, though not till she had been the mother of three children. . . . After this I married a wife who had lived at Crete, but a Jewess by birth," and he proceeds to eulogize her character. Now Josephus is not suspected of giving undue prominence to his own defects; and this artless candour about his matrimonial career speaks volumes as to the state of Jewish opinion on the question of divorce.

The woman of Samaria is another sufficiently startling instance. She was indeed discredited in the eyes of her fellow townsmen, but, apparently, because after her fifth divorce she had not gone through the form of marriage for the sixth time. Bishop Westcott remarks (note on John vi. 18) that facilities for divorce are said to have been fewer among the Samaritans than among the Jews!

Only as we realize these prevalent ideas and customs as to the sanctity of wedlock, can we understand the "temptation" of the Pharisees' enquiry "Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for *every* cause?", and the deliberate weight of our Lord's reply. He confronts His questioners with the Divine ideal of marriage, as witnessed to by their

ancient Scripture. What is bound in heaven may not be loosed on earth. Why then did the law allow divorce? Only as a concession to the passions of the people to whom it was a schoolmaster. Divorce was permitted by accommodation to the "hardness of heart" of a rude and barbarous time; but it had no place "in the beginning," in the primitive institution of God.

Our Lord then repeats His own law of divorce, already spoken in the Sermon on the Mount, St. Matthew v. 31, 32. In both places He begins with the decisive "I say unto you," as though to emphasize this solitary detail of practical ethics on which (so far as we know) He condescended to legislate. The exact scope of His command, here and in the parallel passages, has been disputed. Yet without entering into controversy, we may say broadly that even if Christ permits divorce for adultery, He forbids it for any other cause whatever.

Now it is hard for us to enter into the prejudices and sentiments of the listening disciples so as to appreciate the staggering effect of such an utterance upon their minds. It turned upside-down their whole traditional ideas on that subject, on which, of all subjects, men cling most tenaciously to tradition. St. Mark tells us that in their bewilderment they "asked Christ again in the house of the same matter," and received the same reply. For these disciples were not cold-blooded Rabbinic casuists, but roughly-bred plain-minded peasants; and their practical sense was struck at once by the practical inconvenience of such a rigid rule. Their comment is naïvely simple. They say in effect, "This would never work. If the bond between man and wife is to be so indissoluble, it were wiser to keep free from its risks." Just as once before, when our Lord had shocked them by His paradox about the difficulty of rich men entering the Kingdom, they were astonished out of measure, and said "who then can be saved?" so now, when He

makes divorce at least equally difficult, they are astonished out of measure again, and say, "Who then dare be married?" Under such conditions the celibate would be better off.

And then our Lord takes up their words, and answers their amazement in sentences which to Jewish ears must have sounded more amazing still. "Yes," He says, in effect, "it is true. You may not understand Me, but celibacy can, in certain cases, be a holier and nobler state than marriage. There are some who are celibate perforce, by defect of nature or cruelty of man. But there are others who elect to live unmarried for the sake of God and His Kingdom." Can we not hear in His tones some conscious hint of His own solitary human lot? Can we not feel His half-mournful sense of His friends' dulness and lack of sympathy, as He looked into their blank faces, and broke off as He began, by repeating "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it"?

These disciples were not able. They were Jewish working-men, bred in the belief that early marriage was one of a Jew's imperative religious duties—a duty which, we cannot doubt, they had almost without exception observed. This exaltation of celibacy, even in Christ's guarded words, utterly confounded them. It shocked their deepest human prejudices. And *just at this moment*, while they stood aghast at His teaching, they found themselves and their Master surrounded with women, who were bringing their little ones for Christ to touch and to bless. The disciples were not thin-skinned; but they could feel the utter incongruity of the situation. They revolted at these intrusive mothers and babes, so painfully out of place and season. The Lord had doubtless caressed children before, but it seemed a profanity to thrust them upon Him just now, with such dark unnatural childless words on His lips. No wonder "the disciples rebuked them."

And then Christ showed the perfect balance of His sacred humanity. In one breath He could speak the beatitude of the lonely celibate. In the next breath He could pray over the children as He took them up in His arms. There was nothing narrow or ascetic or one-sided in the temper of the Son of Man. Dare we reverently recognise in His peculiar tenderness for children some pathetic trace of the hunger of a childless heart? Surely it was not by chance that our Lord made childhood into a sort of sacrament. Just as He took our homeliest bodily acts, the act of washing and the act of eating, and consecrated them into pledges and channels of His grace, so He took the youngest and simplest and most helpless human creatures, and set children to be the mystic representatives of Himself, the patterns of His Spirit, the parables of His Gospel in the world. Amid all the dimness and discouragement of these latter days we can at least be thankful because the modern Church has entered, as never before, into this sacrament of childhood. We may miss the Real Presence in some symbols wherein He was once discerned; but we find Him, as really as ever, when we gather His lambs in our arms and carry them in our bosoms.

Such a spiritual sequence as has been indicated between the two parts of this narrative may at first sight appear over-subtle. At least it explains a very difficult detail; it shows us naturally why

“When mothers of Salem their children brought to Jesus,
The stern disciples drove them back, and bade them depart.”

That attitude of disciples who knew their Master's characteristic fondness for children always seemed inexplicable to me, until a friend suggested the idea which is here worked out, and which grows more convincing as it grows more familiar.

Moreover, if this explanation be admitted, it absolutely authenticates the narrative. For it will be felt at once that such a point is beyond any dreams of possible redactors. The incidents stand here together in this order, because they happened in this order; and the first illuminates the second.

T. HERBERT DARLOW.

THE WASHING OF THE DISCIPLES' FEET.

JOHN XIII. 1-17.

THERE were two sacramental acts performed that night, when Jesus gathered His disciples in "the upper chamber" at Jerusalem; for the washing of their feet was, as truly as the breaking of bread, "an outward and visible sign of an inward and invisible grace." But the one has fallen out of use, while the other remains, and will, doubtless, continue to refresh and comfort the Church, "until He come." There is, indeed, a faint shadow of the first of these sacramental rites still, I believe, to be witnessed in Rome during "Holy Week," when the Pope sprinkles a little water on the feet of certain chosen persons, and touches them daintily with a towel. It is only a shadow of the beautiful reality, yet so far it bears witness to the law of God's kingdom, that he is the greatest there who consents to the humblest service. Perhaps, too, it has not been without its influence in helping to maintain, throughout that branch of the Church, the tradition of lowly, self-denying ministry, which is one of its strongest claims to be esteemed among men. Let us see, then, how this service arose, and what was intended by it. It will be worth our while to devote a little serious thought to it; for I venture to think that he who puts from him "the basin and the towel" is very ill prepared to take the bread, and "the cup of blessing."

We know, from other incidents recorded in the gospels, that Jesus and His disciples were not very careful about those constant ablutions on which the Pharisees insisted so strongly. Life was too earnest for them to occupy themselves with conventional niceties. But this was a great occasion when a little ceremony was not unfitting, and when, moreover, a precious lesson was to be read. Before

the Passover, then,—not when the supper was ended, nor yet while it was going on, but when it had been served, *i.e.* when all the preparation for it had been completed—Jesus, we are told, “rose from the table and took a basin and towel, and began to wash the feet of the disciples.” We are not left in any doubt as to what moved Him to do this. Some, indeed, will have it that the apostles had been quarrelling, “which of them was to be greatest in the kingdom,” and that their Lord meant tacitly to rebuke them by performing a task which was commonly left to one of the meanest slaves of a household. Certainly, they had pretty often unworthy contentions of this kind, and it is likely enough that something of the sort had been lately going on; nor can it be denied that the lesson which Christ reads them here is a warning against the indulgence of any such worldly ambitions. But John makes no allusion to any outbreak of this temper at this time, neither is there any tone of rebuke in our Lord’s words here; and, besides, the whole matter is lifted up into a higher and serener atmosphere by the statement of Christ’s motive which the apostle actually gives.

“Jesus,” he says, “knowing that his hour was come, that He should depart out of this world unto the Father, having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end.” That was what moved Him to do what He now did. It was a solemn moment. The shadow of death was on Him. He had come from the Father, because He loved them. He was going back to the Father for the same reason, because that “was expedient for them.” He was fain, therefore, to make this quite clear to them, that nothing which had happened had any wise changed His mind, but that, on the contrary, “having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end.” Many people begin life, full of a beautiful enthusiasm, with generous instincts and glowing hopes, con-

fidant that men only need to be rightly handled in order to make the world as good and happy as they would like to see it. But ere long this illusion fades away. They meet with disappointments, with ingratitude, with repeated failures; and by-and-by all their fine enthusiasm is changed into a cynical contempt that has no faith in man at all. Jesus never cherished any such illusions. He always "knew what was in man," and nevertheless he loved us. Therefore, though He had met with as much ingratitude and selfishness as any one, though he had been despised and rejected of men to whom He was always doing good, and though even His own chosen disciples understood so little the mind of their Master, and grieved His very heart so often, yet His hope never failed Him, and His Spirit never changed. He was the same at the end as at the beginning. He never wearied of His service, or despaired of His cause. "Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end." It did not make any difference even that one of His disciples was about to betray Him. He knew it, but He did not except Judas from the service he was about to render to them all. Nothing, not even the utmost baseness, could any wise change His heart, or cause its faithfulness to fail.

It was this unwearying, unvarying love, then, which constrained Him to take the basin, and gird Himself with the towel that night, as one whose heart yearned in Him not only to serve them, but to serve them in some peculiarly lowly fashion, to which nothing but love would have condescended. We are not told that He began this task with Peter, but from the way in which that apostle acted on this occasion, I make no doubt, for my part, that he was the first. For if he said to his Lord, "Thou shalt never wash my feet," you may be very sure he would not have stood by silent, and seen Him do it to any of the others. He would have been quite as positive in their case as in his own, that it was an un-

seemly proceeding, that it would become them better to wash the Master's feet, and that they ought to be ashamed to let Him do so mean a service to them. I cannot imagine him looking on without a vehement protest. Of course, his rejection of this service in his own case was wrong, for it meant that he knew better than Jesus Himself did what it became his Lord to do. Yet there was also a right element in it, for it implied that it would have been more seemly for him and the other disciples to do it for their Lord. Therefore Jesus found no fault with his hasty, but on the whole right-hearted, follower; but only gently replied, "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me." That saying points to something higher than the immediate work He had in hand. Hence, Jesus had said, "What I do thou knowest not now, but thou shalt know hereafter." There was a deeper and more inward cleansing than this, of which the washing of their feet was but a symbol. Truly we have no part in Christ if we do not submit ourselves to Him to have all our spiritual defilements removed, and to be "washed white as snow." When Peter heard this saying, though he did not yet know all it meant, and was only to learn it rather slowly hereafter, yet because it was all in all to him to have his part in Christ, he swung now from the one extreme of reluctance to the other extreme of over-readiness, saying, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head." If that be a condition of fellowship with Thee, wash me all over; do with me as Thou wilt; I will consent to anything sooner than part with Thee. All through the scene, Peter shows the same impetuous, but honest and affectionate heart. All through also there is a want of that simple submission to a higher wisdom, and a deeper love than his own, whose claim on all men is that they should learn to say, "Not as we will, but as Thou wilt." Therefore Jesus had to restrain his impetuosity now by saying, "He that is bathed needeth

not save to wash his feet only, but is clean every whit."

They had just come from the bath, probably a public one, whither they had all gone to prepare for the feast. It may have been near, or it may have been at some distance; but in any case they had walked some way in their sandals along the streets of Jerusalem. It is not a very cleanly city; no Eastern town is. One could not go far along its streets without being smirched by its mire more or less, or at the very least being soiled by its dust. They had come clean from the bath, then, but their feet had suffered in their walk from it to the upper chamber. Apparently they had not felt any discomfort from this. It was not so bad as to cause any inconvenience to them. But still the mire or the dust was there, and Jesus was fain to have them clean every whit. He did not spy out their defilement, nor did He seek to point it out, but He was anxious to cleanse it away. All they needed for this was that their feet should be washed, and that service He was now fain to do them, lowly as it was.

I have said that this act of Christ's pointed to a deeper, even an inward, spiritual cleansing; and beautiful as it was in itself, it is this spiritual aspect of it which is of most importance to us. In this higher province, too, I wish to note that the *bath* is one thing, and the *basin* is another. There is a whole-washing, which is of chief moment, and there is a feet-washing, which has also to be seen to. The first is "the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost," of which we may truly say that he who has not received it "hath no part with Christ." "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature; old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new." That is the bath which makes him clean every whit, "for he is washed, for he is justified, for he is sanctified," and his sins which were as scarlet are now white as snow. But we do not go

very far along the world's miry ways before our white garments begin to be spotted, and our feet to be soiled. We do not walk there long undefiled. Ere many days pass we need another cleansing. It is not the whole washing of regeneration. That does not require to be done over again. Too often, I think, we forget this, and pray in such ways as if it had been so imperfect a work that it needed to be often repeated. Is there not something unreal in such requests? If we have reason to believe that we have received the Holy Ghost, and been born again "not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible," are we quite acting as we should, if we go on praying like Peter, "Lord, not my feet only, but also my hands and my head"? Yet even if we do not a second time need that washing of the whole man, we do require our feet to be cleansed, and that again and again, for we often slip, we often err, we often stumble into miry ways, we often sorrowfully defile ourselves. Not once in a way, but constantly, we need to be forgiven, and to get a new start with a fresh sense of the grace of Christ Jesus. Therefore is He always waiting with the basin and the towel to cleanse us, because He loved us from the beginning, and loves us to the end. O His wonderful patience! O His tender mercy! He never wearies of this task; He never changes to us; if we will only let Him, He is ever ready to "heal our backslidings." And this also is specially to be noted. When God's people, who have been washed in the laver of regeneration, fail, as they too often do, to "keep themselves from the pollution that is in the world through lust," they find many "candid friends" who are ready enough to point this out, and plenty of others who are not friends at all, but who are keen to spy out their blemishes. That is the world's way. It has a sharp eye for the infirmities of the righteous, and that may be so far good for the righteous, though it is not over creditable to the others who indulge in it. But God's way is not like

theirs. He is not eager to spy out faults ; He does not delight in pointing them out. It is no pleasure to Him to shame His people. But He is ever ready to wash them. Of course, that implies that He sees our errors, and more or less also that He brings us to see them, for He does not take away the evils which we are not desirous to put away. Still, His main concern is not to draw attention to our failures, but to correct them ; not to point out how our feet are smirched, but to wash them, even when we ourselves hardly know how much they need to be cleansed.

For it abides true for ever, that "if He wash us not we have no part with Him." He loved us indeed "while we were yet sinners": that is the very glory of His love, that it made its great sacrifice on our behalf, "while we were without strength and ungodly." In that sense, there is no soul living, however defiled by sin, that has not a part in Him if it will only believe, and claim its portion in His grace. But we must be cleansed by Him, we must be "born again," and the whole spirit of our life changed and purified ere we can enter into His kingdom, and enjoy its hallowed peace, and its eternal hope. Therefore Jesus said, "if I wash thee not, thou hast no part with Me"; our portion is only a possibility, not a present reality, till we are made new creatures in Him. But now, in addition to this, we are reminded that even after this great change has been wrought in us we may defile our ways, and lose the sweetness of His fellowship for a season. He that hath been bathed may well need his feet still to be washed. For if we walk in the world's miry paths, if we yield to the pride and selfishness of the carnal heart, which has to be crucified and not indulged, it will be vain for us to look for the spiritual peace and gladness which we at one time knew. The salvation may still be ours, but the joy of it will be gone. Christ will not company with us in those our evil

ways. The smile that once cheered us, the light that once shone about our feet, the counsel that once so lovingly directed us, will be with us no more, till in true contrition of heart we "forsake our evil ways and our unrighteous thoughts, and turn to the Lord," to be made clean every whit." Which of us has not known such times of sad forsaking? Who has not felt the dulness, the depression, the loneliness of such hours? And the cause of them is, not that He is fickle and inconstant, but that we have not been careful to walk undefiled in the way. Happily "He does not even then utterly turn away His lovingkindness from us," but waits with the basin and the towel to wash the feet of His disciples.

Having finished His task, then, Jesus said unto them, "Know ye what I have done unto you?" Do ye understand what this service means? "Ye call Me Lord and Master, and ye say well, for so I am. If I then, your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, ye ought also to wash one another's feet. For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you. The servant is not greater than his Lord, neither is one that is sent greater than he that sent him." If the Apostles had been lately disputing which of them was to be greatest, as they too often did, this was His rebuke of their poor ambition. And no doubt they felt it. This lowly service would impress on them the word He had once before spoken, "He that would be great among you, let him be your minister." But I am not sure that He intended any rebuke at this time. The whole scene appears rather to breathe a spirit of tenderness and love, and though there may be a glance at their vain and foolish thoughts, the main idea it suggests to me is, that it was the consecration of that kind of lowly, self-denying service, that personal ministry of love, which is the surest way of having communion with Christ. It was not a pleasant task, that of washing the

feet. A sensitive person naturally shrank from it, and it commonly fell to some old domestic, little fit for anything else. No one cared much to handle the dusty, miry feet of the pilgrim, not seldom covered, too, with sores. Yet, on the other hand, if there were few tasks more unpleasant to those who did them, there were also few more grateful to those who received such a service. What our Lord, then, specially meant to teach His disciples was, that if there was anything by which they could aid and comfort their fellow-pilgrims on earth, no matter how displeasing, even how revolting it might be to their natural sensibilities, they must gird themselves to do it, even as he had done. Nothing must be too humble for their love, nothing so distasteful that they would not put their hand to it, if thereby they might anywise lessen the miseries of men. Are there diseases that have to be nursed and tended? Are there wounds that have to be cleansed and bound up? Are there impurities in the homes of the poor that are sapping the health of the people? And do you somehow shrink from coming in contact with such things? Does not our Lord's example here tell us that love must overcome that distaste, and that if in any way we can help to heal or comfort our brethren, we must take the basin and towel and do the humblest service that is needed? Do we call Him Lord and Master, and yet shrink from doing what He did? Are we above the tasks which were not beneath Him? And is there anything, any argument of reason, any splendour of eloquence—which has so commended the gospel to the human heart as the tender ministrations of the sister of mercy or the hospital nurse, who for the love of Christ denies herself that she may bring healing and comfort to the affected? I do not say that every one is to take up exactly that *burden*. But in some form or other, every one will readily find, in his own home, or in that of his neighbour, some service of this kind needing to be done

—some task which may be very lowly, and not very pleasant perhaps, but in which he can show himself to be a true follower of Him who washed the feet of His disciples. “The servant is not greater than his Lord. I have given you an example that ye should do to others as I have done to you.” Believe me there are few ways in which you can better serve Christ, and further His cause, than by thus taking His yoke upon you, who was meek and lowly in heart.

That, I reckon, was the prime lesson of this sacramental rite. But surely it also meant to teach us that we too, like our Lord, must not be anxious to spy out, or to point out, the frailties and errors of His people, but always to wash them out. God's people unhappily do not steadfastly walk undefiled in the way. Their hearts may be right, yet too often they err and go astray. And when they do, there are many who are fain to draw attention to their failures, and very few who come with help to set them right. That is not the spirit of Christ, though it is only too common among Christians. Does it give you a kind of pleasure, then, to see them going wrong? Are you ready to draw attention to their weak points? Do their sins never escape your notice? and do you never think of covering them with the cloak of charity, or lovingly plead with the erring ones to amend their ways? Do you never feel that their conduct may have given you an opportunity to take the basin, and follow the example of Jesus? It would be better for you as well as for them, if you read the lesson of your Master in that sense. It would make a more beautiful Christian world if, instead of the fault-finding and evil-speaking which abound in it, we were all only careful to heal our neighbour's backslidings—to wash the feet of the disciples. It is somewhat curious that the rite of Baptism which Jesus never practised, but left it to be done by His disciples, has maintained its place in the

Church along with the other sacrament of Communion, while this of washing the feet, which He not only did Himself, but expressly enjoined them also to practise, has practically disappeared except as a kind of show-function, or a counsel of perfection in one branch of His Church. Possibly it had been used by some as a platform for the display of a false and pretentious humility, and thus fell into discredit. At any rate, it has vanished as a sacramental Act from the common worship of the Church : and on that very account it seems desirable that it should get all the more prominence in our teaching, lest the spirit which it was meant to cherish should be allowed to die out also. That would be a fatal mistake. The loss of a form of ritual may be no great matter, but the loss of the spirit which it embodied would be greatly to be deplored. Happily of late years there has been a revival of it, at least on one side of its ministry. The tender hand of loving service is now readily tending the sick and the poor, and is not withheld even from the humblest task, neither does it shrink from that which is most trying to our natural sensibilities. Very beautiful it is to me to see so much of the youth and hope of Christendom consecrating itself to this lowly ministry, taking the basin and towel, as it were, from the hand of the Master to wash His soiled and foot-sore pilgrims. But the other side of this symbol—the charity that is not eager to spy out, or to point out the disciples' faults and shortcomings, but seeks only to remove these blemishes, that is not so common, though it be quite as beautiful in its way. Certainly the Christian life is lived under the blaze of a very searching light to-day, and I do not object to that if it were only a friendly light. We are apt enough to soil our feet, and take no thought, and even feel no great discomfort from it. It is well, then, to be reminded of our high calling to a walk of holiness and truth and love, and

well to be arrested if at any time we are not "undefiled in the way." But surely it is the part of a Christian not to be keen to detect a brother's failures, still less to blazon them abroad, but with loving tenderness to "restore his soul," and lead him back into the way of God. "If ye know these things, happy are ye if ye do them."

WALTER SMITH.

ON ST. JOHN XXI. 15-17.

THE passage John xxi. 15-17 is marked in the original by a variety of language which does not appear in the English translation. It runs as follows: "So when they had dined, Jesus saith to Simon Peter, Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou (*ἀγαπᾷς*) Me more than these? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord; Thou knowest (*οἶδας*) that I love (*φιλῶ*) Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My lambs (*βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία μου*). He saith to him again the second time, Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou (*ἀγαπᾷς*) Me? He saith unto Him, Yea, Lord, Thou knowest (*οἶδας*) that I love (*φιλῶ*) Thee. He saith unto him, Feed My sheep (*ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου*). He saith unto him the third time, Simon, *son* of Jonas, lovest thou (*φιλεῖς*) Me? Peter was grieved because He said unto him the third time, Lovest thou (*φιλεῖς*) Me? And he said unto Him, Lord, Thou knowest (*οἶδας*) all *things*; Thou knowest (*γινώσκεις*) that I love (*φιλῶ*) Thee. Jesus saith unto him, Feed My sheep (*βόσκει τὰ προβάτά μου*)." Here we have two different Greek words for each of the English words "love," "know," and "feed," and three Greek words for "sheep" or "lambs." Some of the older commentators did not attribute any special significance to these variations in the language. "Promiscue hic usurpavit Johannes *ἀγαπᾷν* [*diligere*] et *φιλεῖν* [*amare*]," said Grotius, "ut mox *βόσκειν* [*pascere*] et *ποιμαίνειν* [*custodire*]. Neque hic quærendæ sunt subtilitates." And he adds, "Quod de voce *βόσκειν* (*pascendi*) et *ποιμαίνειν* (*custodiendi*), idem de vocibus *προβάτων* (*pecoris*) et *ἀρνίων* (*agnorum*) intelligendum est: nam et hæc promiscue usurpantur, ut apparet ex collatione locorum, Matth. x. 16. Luc. x. 3." Erasmus and Valla were also of opinion that there was no distinction intended by the change of words. But modern English commentators incline to the view that there is an

important significance in the transition from one word to the other. Alford, for example, says, "The distinction between ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν must not here be lost sight of, nor must we superficially say with Grotius, "Promiscue his usurpavit Johannes ἀγαπᾶν et φιλεῖν, etc." He further urges that βόσκειν and ποιμαίνειν cannot be synonymous, or ἀρνία, πρόβατα, and προβάτια. Importance has also been attached to the distinction between the two words for "knowing." "The first 'knowest' (οἶδας) refers to Christ's supernatural intuition, as in vv. 15, 16; the second 'knowest' (γινώσκεις) to his experience and discernment; *Thou recognisest, perceivest, seest, that I love Thee.*"¹

Is it possible for us to decide which of these two is the right method of interpretation, whether that of Erasmus and Grotius on the one hand, or of Dean Alford and Dr. Plummer on the other? Is there any way by which we can determine whether the writer used each of these different words with a distinct reference to its exact meaning, or merely varied his language to avoid the monotonous repetition of the same word? The question is of interest because the answer to it may have a bearing upon other passages as well as on that which is immediately before us. Perhaps it may throw some light upon it if we compare the writer's practice on other occasions in the use of words that are similar but not identical.

While there are some cases in which the writer of the Gospel accurately distinguishes between the meanings of words which are similar but different, as between λούειν and νίπτειν in John xiii. 10, between σύρειν and ἔλκειν in xxi. 6, 8, 11, between δοῦλος and ὑπηρέτης in xviii. 18,² there are also instances in which he uses apparently without distinction words that are not precisely equivalent. There is an example of this in the early part of chapter xxi.

¹ The Rev. Dr. Plummer in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*.

² See in each of these cases Trench's *Synonyms of the New Testament*.

The vessel in which the apostles were fishing is first called *πλοῖον* (*vv.* 3, 6), and then *πλοιάριον* (*v.* 8). It is remarkable that the same two words are applied in a similar way to the vessels that are mentioned in the sixth chapter. First the word *πλοῖον* is used four times (*vv.* 17, 19, 21), then *πλοιάριον* three times (*vv.* 22, 23), and then *πλοῖον* again (*v.* 24). There can be no doubt that in both of these chapters the two words are applied to the same vessels, or that the words themselves are strictly speaking different in meaning. This looks as if the two words were used simply to avoid monotony, just as we might use the word "ship" and "vessel." Very similar is the way in which the two words *τεκνία* and *παιδιά* are used in the First Epistle of St. John, where in the English versions the sense seems satisfied by the loving words "little children" all through. The writer changes from *τεκνία*, which is used twice (*ii.* 1, 12), to *παιδιά*, which is also used twice (*ii.* 13, 18), and then back again to *τεκνία*, which is now repeated five times (*ii.* 28, *iii.* 7, 18, *iv.* 4, *v.* 21). As further instances of the same apparent indifference or intentional variation in the use of similar words, we may cite the change of the preposition in John i. 45, "Now Philip was of (*ἀπὸ*) Bethsaida, (*ἐκ*) the city of Andrew and Peter," or in John i. 48, 50, "When thou wast under (*ὑπὸ*) the fig tree, I saw thee. . . . Because I said unto thee, I saw thee underneath (*ὑποκάτω*) the fig tree." Apparently of the same kind is the employment of the words *πράσσειν* and *ποιεῖν* in *iii.* 20, 21, "For every one that doeth (*πράσσω*) evil, hateth the light. . . . But he that doeth (*ποιῶν*) truth cometh to the light," or of *λέγειν* and *λαλεῖν* in *xvi.* 18, "What is this that He saith (*λέγει*), A little while? We cannot tell what He saith" (*λαλεῖ*). Different expressions are sometimes introduced where the same thing is evidently intended by both, as in *iii.* 3, 5, where "see (*ἰδεῖν*) the kingdom of God" is clearly interchangeable with "enter

(εἰσελθεῖν εἰς) the kingdom of God." The difference between the words which describe the position of the beloved disciple in xiii. 23, "leaning on Jesus' bosom" (ἀνακείμενος . . . ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) and those in v. 25, "lying on Jesus' breast" (ἀναπεσὼν . . . ἐπὶ τὸ στῆθος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ) has led some to suppose that a change of posture on his part is indicated by the latter words. But a comparison of the other places where the words here used occur in the Gospel (see vi. 10, 11, xiii. 12) renders it much more probable that we have here only two different ways of describing the same position, that is, another instance of the language being varied without a corresponding variation in the sense being intended.¹

If we turn our attention from the writer's general habit of composition to the particular words used in the passage which we are considering, we are first attracted by the pair ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν. The distinction between those two words is well known, and it is one that we may suppose would attract the especial attention of a Christian writer. But we do not find that this distinction is always observed either in the Fourth Gospel or by the other New Testament writers. On the contrary, the two words are often interchanged. The higher Christian word ἀγαπᾶν is used of loving darkness (John iii. 19), of loving the praise of men (xii. 43), of loving the world (1 John ii. 15), of loving them that love you, even as sinners do (Luke vi. 32), of the Pharisees loving the uppermost seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets (Luke xi. 43, φιλεῖν being used in the corresponding passages, Matt. xxiii. 6, and Luke xx. 46), of loving this present life (2 Tim. iv. 10), and the wages of iniquity (2 Pet. ii. 15); while on the other hand, φιλεῖν is sometimes used where we should certainly expect to find ἀγαπᾶν, if the distinction between the two words was regarded by the writer as in any sense

¹ See the *Westminster Review* for August, 1890, pp. 178, 179.

a necessary one. *Φιλεῖν* is the word used in John v. 20, "The Father loveth the Son" (though see the various readings); in xvi. 27, "The Father loveth (*φιλεῖ*) you, because ye have loved (*πεφιλήκατε*) Me." The disciple whom Jesus loved is once *ὃν ἐφίλει ὁ Ἰησοῦς* (xx. 2), *ἀγαπᾶν* being used twice. *Φιλεῖν* is also used in 1 Corinthians xvi. 22, "If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ"; in Titus iii. 15, "Them that love us in the faith"; and in Apocalypse iii. 19, "As many as I love, I rebuke and chasten."

We quoted above Dr. Plummer's statement of the difference between the meanings of the words *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω*. The former refers, he says, to Christ's supernatural intuition, "Thou knowest all things"; the latter to His experience and discernment, "Thou knowest (*i.e.* seest) that I love Thee." But if this distinction between the words was really present to the mind of the writer of the Gospel, we should naturally expect him to have used *εἰδέναι*, not *γινώσκειν* in ii. 24, 25, when he speaks of the knowledge of all men which Jesus possessed. This knowledge of all men would be a matter of divine intuition, not of human experience, as much as the knowledge of all things, of which the text speaks. But in speaking of it the writer twice uses the word *γινώσκειν*: "Jesus did not commit Himself unto them because He knew (*διὰ τὸ γινώσκειν*) all men, and needed not that any should testify of man: for He knew (*ἐγίνωσκε*) what was in man."

On the words "Feed My sheep" (or, "lambs") Maldonatus, who takes the same view as Grotius and Erasmus, says that *βόσκειν* and *ποιμαίνειν* mean the same thing, and that the Hebrew word *פָּרַךְ*, which the LXX. translate *ποιμαίνειν*, means "to feed." He says, "*Pascere esse regere ac gubernare, sed ita regere, tanquam pastorem gregem, nemo nescit, et alibi (on Matt. ii. 6) sæpe docuimus Hebraeorum idioma esse. Qui regis Israël, intende (Ps. lxxix. 2), Hebraice est פָּרַךְ; qui pascis.*" He also refers to Psalm

lxxvii. 71, 72, where the same Hebrew word is rendered in the LXX. ποιμαίνειν and ἐποίμαεν, in the Vulgate *pascere* and *pavit*, and in the English A.V. and R.V., *feed* and *fed*. See also 2 Samuel vii. 7.

He adds that the words "sheep" and "lambs" mean the same persons, as they do in Matthew x. 16, "I send you forth as sheep in the midst of wolves," and in Luke x. 3, "I send you forth as lambs among wolves." The only difference is that one is a more tender and affectionate expression than the other. His words are:—

"Agnos esse eos qui in grege, id est in ecclesiâ Christi, essent, dubium non est. Nec subtiliter disputandum, cur agnos potius quam oves appellaverit; quod qui fecerit, videat etiam atque etiam ne doctis hominibus risum præbeat. Satis enim constat eosdem nunc agnos et v. 17 oves appellare. Quod si quidquam discriminis inter oves et agnos est, id non in re sed in voce est; quod quum idem sint, tamen vocabulum agni blandius sit majoremque amorem præ se ferat; magis enim amabiles, quia magis simplices agni quam oves sunt. Quemadmodum, quos Matth. x. 16, *oves* vocat: *Ecce, ego mitto vos, sicut agnos in medio luporum.* Lucas cap. x. 3, *agnos* nominat: *Ecce, ego mitto vos, sicut agnos inter lupos.* Cum ergo Christus fideles suos *agnos* vocat, blandius et majore quâdam amoris significatione eos Petro commendaret quam cum vocat *oves*. Quemadmodum si pater moriens et liberos suos amico commendans diceret: *Commendo tibi meos infantulos, vehementius, majoreque affectu commendaret, quam si diceret: commendo tibi filios meos.*"

He adds, however, that the preacher may say with Rupert and Theophylact, that the lambs are those who are young in the faith, and the sheep those in whom Christ is more fully formed. But he is to be careful "ne ludat longius."

The following note from Dunwell's useful *Commentary on the Four Gospels* is of importance:—

"It may not be out of place to observe that of the four Greek commentators, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, Theophylact, and Euthymius, who have commented at considerable length on vers. 15-17, no one of them has drawn attention to the distinction between φιλῆῖς and ἀγαπᾶς, and between βόσκει τὰ ἀρνία, ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατα, etc., set forth in these

notes. Their silence may arise either from the fact that they were not cognizant of such distinctions, or that they were so well known to their hearers and readers as not to require being pointed out."

It would greatly strengthen the case of those who find a meaning in the change of words, if the alleged meaning was clear and certain. But this is not so. In John xiii. 10, the distinction between *λούειν* and *νίπτειν* is obvious and necessary. And the distinction between *σύρειν* and *ἔλκειν* in xxi. 6, 8, 11, is also pretty certain. But there is no such certainty or agreement as to the significance of Peter's substitution of *φιλεῖν* for *ἀγαπᾶν* in his reply to the question of Jesus. Alford, Bengel, Plummer, Trench and Wordsworth have all different ways of explaining it. There is more agreement as to the twice recurring *βόσκει* and the one *ποιμαίνει*, Trench and Wordsworth both agreeing with Stanley that to feed the flock, to provide them with spiritual nourishment, as distinct from ruling them, is the first and the last thing. But Plummer thinks that "the lambs, which can go no distance, scarcely require guidance, their chief need is food. The sheep require both." Alford can only say, "Perhaps the *feeding of the lambs* was the furnishing the apostolic testimony of the resurrection and facts of the Lord's life on earth to the first converts; the *shepherding* or ruling *the sheep*, the subsequent government of the Church as shown forth in the early part of the Acts; the *feeding of the προβάτια*, the choicest, the loved of the flock, the furnishing the now maturer Church of Christ with the wholesome food of the doctrine contained in His Epistles." ¹

It appears then (1) that the writer of the Gospel commonly uses words that are similar but not quite synonymous without regard to the difference between them; (2)

¹ If the reading *ἀρνία* . . . *πρόβατα* . . . *προβάτια* be correct, the resemblance to *τεκνία* (*παιδιά*) . . . *πατέρες* . . . *νεανίσκοι* in 1 John ii. 12-14 is remarkable, and can hardly be undesigned.

that the distinction between ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν is not always observed by the New Testament writers; (3) that the alleged distinction between οἶδα and γινώσκω is not supported by the use of γινώσκω in John ii. 24, 25; (4) that Maldonatus makes out a strong case for denying the distinctions made between "Feed my lambs" and "Shepherd my sheep"; (5) that the Greek commentators, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyril, Theophylact, and Euthymius have never mentioned any of the distinctions upon which so much of the meaning of this interesting passage is supposed to turn; and finally (6) that the alleged distinctions do not yield any definite or satisfactory meaning upon which commentators can be agreed.

Before leaving the subject another passage may be mentioned. The common explanation of the words "Forty and six years was this temple in building" (John ii. 20) supposes that they refer to the interval between the year when Josephus says that Herod began to rebuild the temple and the year in which the words were spoken, the temple being then still incomplete. *If this explanation be correct*, then the word ναός is used for ἱερόν in this passage, because Josephus says distinctly that the building of the ναός was completed by the priests in a year and six months (*Antt.* xv., xi. 6). It was only the outer part, the ἱερόν, that remained unfinished. Josephus himself confuses the two words, using ναός for ἱερόν in this very account of the building of the temple.¹ Trench is in error in supposing that he always observed the distinction between them (*N.T. Synonyms*, p. 12). The Archbishop seems to have made another slip in arguing that ναός is correctly used in Matthew xxvii. 5. He says, "How vividly does it set forth to us the despair and defiance of Judas, that he presses into the ναός itself (Matt. xxvii. 5), into the 'adytum'

¹ περιελάμβανε στοαῖς τὸν ναόν ἅπαντα (cinxit totum templum porticibus). *Jos., Antt.* xv., xiv. Ed. Weidmanni.

which was set apart for the priests alone, and there casts down before them the accursed price of blood! Those expositors who affirm that here *ναός* stands for *ἱερόν*, should adduce some other passage in which the one is put for the other" (*N.T. Synonyms*, p. 14). He appears to have forgotten for the moment that it was "to the chief priests and elders" (Matt. xxvii. 3), that is, to the Sanhedrim, not to the priests alone that Judas brought the money. The Sanhedrim may have sat in the *ἱερόν*, but not in the *ναός*. Alford is also anxious to maintain the correct use of *ναός* and says "We must conceive him as speaking to them (the priests—and elders?) without, and throwing the money into the *ναός*." But there is only the one merit in this interpretation. On the whole the consideration of these two passages taken along with Josephus's use of *ναός* for *ἱερόν* tends to shake our faith in the axiom that the distinction between the two words is always observed in New Testament Greek.

One cannot help thinking that the minute study of the text of the New Testament in modern times, while it has undoubtedly done much to elucidate the full meaning of the sacred record, has sometimes carried scholars too far in refinement of interpretation. They attribute to the New Testament writers an accuracy of language which the English Translators certainly did not aim at. Is there any reason for so doing?

JOHN A. CROSS.

THE LAKE OF GALILEE.

IN a previous paper the dominant features of Galilee were shown to be seven. First, a close dependence on Lebanon. Second, an abundance of water, which Lebanon lavishes on her by rain, mists, wells and full-born streams. Third, a great fertility: profusion of flowers, corn, oil and wood. Fourth, volcanic elements: extinct craters, dykes of basalt, hot springs, liability to earthquakes. Fifth, great roads: highways of the world cross Galilee in all directions—from the Levant to Damascus and the East, from Jerusalem to Antioch, from the Nile to the Euphrates. Sixth, in result of the fertility and of the roads, busy industries and commerce, with a crowded population. And, seventh, the absence of a neighbouring desert, such as infected Judæa with austerity, but in its place a number of heathen provinces, pouring upon Galilee the full influence of their Greek life.

Now all these seven features of Galilee in general were concentrated upon her Lake and its coasts. The Lake of Galilee was the focus of the whole province. Imagine that wealth of water, that fertility, those nerves and veins of the volcano, those great highways, that numerous population, that commerce and industry, those strong Greek influences—imagine them all crowded into a deep valley, under an almost tropical heat, and round a great blue lake, and you have before you the conditions in which Christianity arose and Christ chiefly laboured.

We do not realise that the greater part of our Lord's ministry was accomplished at what may be truly called the

bottom of a trench, 680 feet below the level of the sea. As you go down into it by the road which our Lord Himself traversed between Nazareth and Capernaum, there come up to meet you some signals of its wonderful peculiarity. By two broad moors,¹ the grey limestone land falls from the ranges of Lower Galilee to a line of cliffs overlooking the Lake and about 300 feet above it. These terraced moors are broken by dykes of basalt and strewn with lava and pumice-stone. There are almost no trees upon them: after rain the shadeless streams soon die, and the summer grass and bush crackle to tinder. The memories of these moors match their appearance; history knows them as the scenes only of flight and thirst and exhaustion. Across their southern end Sisera fled headlong, and sought drink for his parched throat in the tent of Jael.² By the aspect of the northern end, the imagination of the early Church was provoked to fix upon it as the *desert place*, where, when the day was far spent, and the exhausted multitudes some distance from their villages, our Lord brought forth miracle to feed them.³ And there in crusading times the courage of Christendom was scorched to the heart so as never to rally in all the East again. Where the heights of Hattin offer neither shade nor springs, the Crusaders, tempted, it is said, by some treachery, came forth to meet Saladin. A hot July night without water was followed by a burning day,⁴ to add to the horrors of which the enemy set fire to the scrub. The smoke swept the fevered Christians into a panic; knights choked in their hot armour; the blinded foot-soldiers, breaking their ranks and dropping their weapons, were ridden down in mobs by the Moslem

¹ Now the plateau of Sha'ara and the Sahel el-Ahma.

² So it would seem from Conder's identification of the Kedesh towards which Sisera was flying with Khurbet Kadish on the heights above the Lake.

³ Beyond the sterile aspect of the place there is nothing to justify this tradition.

⁴ 5th July, 1187.

cavalry; and though here and there groups of brave men fought sun and fire and sword far on into the terrible afternoon, the defeat was utter. A militant and truculent Christianity, as false as the relics of the "True Cross" round which it was rallied, met its judicial end within view of the scenes where Christ proclaimed the Gospel of Peace, and went about doing good.

Through such memories, enforcing the effect of the arid landscape, you descend from the hills of Galilee to her Lake. You feel you are passing from the climate and scenery of southern Europe to the climate and scenery of the barer tropics. The sea-winds, which freshen all Galilee and the high Hauran beyond, blow over this basin and the sun beats into it with unmitigated ardour. The atmosphere, for the most part, hangs still and heavy, but the cold currents as they pass from the west are sucked down in vortices of air or by the narrow gorges that break upon the Lake, and then arise those sudden storms for which the region is notorious—

The wind, the tempest roaring high,
The tumult of a tropic sky.

In such conditions a large population and industry would have been as impossible as at the other end of the Jordan but for two redeeming features—the Lake itself and the wealth of fountains and streams which feed it from Lebanon. In that torrid basin, approached through such sterile surroundings, the Lake feeds every sense of the body with life. Sweet water, full of fish, a surface of sparkling blue, tempting down breezes from above, bringing forth breezes of her own, the Lake of Galilee is at once food, drink and air, a rest to the eye, coolness in the heat, an escape from the crowd,¹ and a welcome facility of travel in so exhausting a climate. Even those who do not share her

¹ Mark vi. 32, etc.

memories of Christ feel enthusiasm for her. The Rabbis said: "Jehovah hath created seven seas, but the Sea of Gennesaret is His delight."

The Lake lies in shape like a harp, with the bulge to the north-west. It is nearly thirteen miles long,¹ and its greatest breadth is eight. The wider, northern end is the more open. The Jordan, escaped from a long gorge, enters quietly through a delta of its own deposits. To the west of this delta is thorny, thistly moorland, sloping northwards to a height that leaves over it only Hermon visible, though the basin of Merom lies between. North-west this moorland steepens, rising to the bulk of the hills about Safed, and then as the coast of the Lake trends more rapidly southwards, it drops upon the level Ghuweir—or "little Ghor"—almost certainly the *land of Gennesaret*, which is four miles broad. South of the Ghuweir, the hills close in upon the Lake, with a valley breaking through them from the plateau above. South of this valley they leave but a ribbon of coast, along which Tiberias lies, commanded by its black castle. In contrast to the green open slopes of the north, these dark, imprisoning cliffs, with their black *débris*, impose upon this part of the coast a sombre and sinister aspect, not unsuited for its association with the name of the gloomy tyrant, that by a strange irony of fate has been stamped on a landscape from which the name of Jesus has altogether vanished.² As the south end of the Lake approaches, the ribbon of coast widens, and the Jordan cuts through it, striking at first due west and then south by the foot of the hills. Four miles broad, the Jordan valley leaves a wide prospect from the Lake southward that is closed only by the cliffs of the gorge to which it

¹ On the large Survey Map, from the influx of Jordan to the village of Semakh.

² Lamartine (*Pilgrimage to the Holy Land*, Eng. Ed. I. 269) speaks of "avalanches of black stones," the "black, naked hill," "the sombre and funereal character of the landscape about Tiberias."

narrows twenty miles away. From the East the Yarmuk valley breaks in just below the Lake, distending the Ghor to the dimensions of a great plain; and to the south of the Yarmuk rise the heights of Gadara, commanding this plain and looking up the Lake to Tiberias and the north end. From the Yarmuk northwards up all the eastern side of the Lake runs a wall of hills, the edge of the plateau of Gaulan¹ or Gaulanitis. This is a limestone plateau, but topped by a vast layer of basalt. You see the curious formation as you ascend the gorges which lead upwards from the Lake, for first you pass the dirty white lime strata and then the hard black rocks of the volcanic deposit. Some of the gorges, like that of Fik opposite Tiberias, where Gamala and Hippos stood, are open and gradual enough to have been easily used as highroads in all ages. But others, further north, are wild and impassable.² The wall which the plateau presents to the Lake is higher and more constant than the hills down the western side, but it does not come so close to the beach. Except at Khersa, the eastern coast is about half-a-mile broad, well-watered and fertile.

The view which the whole basin presents has been likened to one of our Scottish lochs. It would need to be one of the least wooded. Few lochs in Scotland have surroundings so stripped of trees as those of the Lake of Galilee are to-day. Except for some palms lingering in Genesaret, a scattering of thorn-bushes all round the coast, brakes of oleander on the eastern shores, and small oaks up the gorges to the Gaulan plateau, trees are not to be seen. The mountain edges are bare, and so are the grey slopes to the north, lifted towards Hermon as a Scottish moor to a snowy Ben. Only one town is visible, Tiberias,

¹ The Hebrew גִּלְיָא, or Gólan, is in classic Arabic pronounced Gaulán, but with the natives of the district it has shortened to the same first syllable as in Hebrew, though of course with soft *g*—*gó*, or *jó*. See Schumacher's *Jaulan*.

² Like the Wady Geramaya described in Schumacher's *Jaulan*, 253.

now a poor fevered place of less than 5,000 inhabitants ; beside it there are not more than three or four small villages round all the coast. There are no farmsteads,¹ nor crofts, such as break the solitude of our most desolate Highland lochs. The lights that come out at night on shore and hill are the camp-fires of wandering Arabs. It is well known, too, how seldom a sail is seen on the surface of the Lake.

How very different it was in the days when Jesus came down from Nazareth to find His home and His disciples upon these shores ! Where there are now no trees there were great woods ; where there are marshes, there were noble gardens ; where there is but a boat or two, there were fleets of sails ; where there is one town, there were nine or ten. We know this from Josephus, who describes the country he governed and fought for only thirty-four years after our Lord's ministry,—too short a time for the country to have changed.

The Plain of Gennesaret had "soil so fruitful, that all sorts of trees would grow upon it, for the temper of the air is so well blended, that it suits those many sorts, especially walnuts, which require the colder air" (that is relatively to the rest), "and flourish there in great plenty. There are palm trees also, which grow best in hot air ; fig trees also and olives grow near them, which require an air more temperate." This conjunction was due, of course, to the steep slope of the Galilean hills, which fall from as high as 4,000 feet above the sea, north of Safed, to 680 below at Gennesaret. In the days of the pride of the land, what a descent it must have been, when one came down from oaks, through olives, sycamores, and walnuts to palms that had their roots washed by the Lake. "One may call this place the ambition of Nature, where it forces those plants that are naturally enemies to one another to agree together :

¹ Except those of the new German colony near Ain et Tabighah, whose red roofs indicate their western builders.

it is a happy contention of the seasons, as if each of them laid claim to this country, for it not only nourishes different sorts of autumnal fruits beyond men's expectation, but preserves them a great while. It supplies men with the principal fruits—grapes and figs continually during ten months of the year, and the rest of the fruits, as they ripen together through the whole year."¹ Even now one sees proof of that luxuriance in the few rich patches of garden upon Gennesaret, in the wealth of flowers on the surrounding slopes, and in the glory of maidenhair fern that springs up wherever there is a stream to give it water and a ruin to give it shade. About Tiberias, the land was probably as bare as now, but from the foot of the Lake to Bethshan was cultivated for wheat, and the incoming valley from Tabor² still holds oleanders deep enough to cover a regiment of horse. The eastern plateau, bare to-day, was certainly well-wooded down even to a recent time, for the place-names imply the presence of forest and copse,³ while some of the wadies by which you descend to the Lake have large oaks, terebinths, plants and carobs, and others are full of bush and brake.

There were nine cities round the Lake, each said to have had not less than 15,000 inhabitants, and some probably with many more. Of these the sites of Tiberias and Magdala on the west shore, and of Gadara and Hippos on the eastern hills are certain. Bethsaida and Capernaum were at the north end, though where exactly, who can tell? Taricheæ is still a matter of controversy, and so is Chorazin. But this we do know, that whatever be the sites to which these names were originally attached, their towns formed round the now bare Lake an almost unbroken ring of building.

Tiberias is said to occupy the site of Raqqath, an ancient town of Naphtali;⁴ and as Raqqath probably means *strip*

¹ III. *Bell. Jud.*, x. 8.

² Wady Feggas.

³ Schumacher, *Jaulan*, 15, 17, 22, 23.

⁴ Josh. xix. 35.

or *coast*, this may be. The Herods did not raise their artificial cities from virgin sites, but generally rebuilt some old town. Why Herod Antipas chose this site is easily conjectured. There may have been difficulties in adapting to his designs for a capital towns so full of commerce as Taricheæ or Capernaum; he may have preferred a site so dominated by the hill above, where he built his castle, and he may have felt the neighbourhood of the baths to be an advantage, perhaps a pecuniary one. His plans were large. Ruins still indicate a wall three miles long.¹ Besides the imposing citadel, there were temples, a palace, a hippodrome, and a great synagogue. The place was complete before our Lord's ministry, and Herod called it after his patron Tiberius. That our Lord is never said to have entered Tiberias is sometimes explained by His habit of avoiding the half-Greek cities, and by the supposition that among courtiers and officials He would be less at home than He was among the common people. But the surroundings, too, of Tiberias were, as we have seen, repellent. The city—a long strip like its predecessor *the Ribbon*—was drawn out on the narrowest part of the coast. The hue of its environment was as of rusty mourning, and the atmosphere was more confined than that on the north of the Lake. Capernaum and Bethsaida must have been more healthy than Tiberias, and through them besides, the greatest of the thoroughfares of Galilee, the *Via Maris*, which did not touch Tiberias at all, poured a steady stream of life. Life, both physical and mental, was more in current in the cities of our Lord's choice than in that of Herod's. Nevertheless, while Bethsaida and Capernaum have passed away, Tiberias endures; and the name of the morbid tyrant still stamps a region from which that of Jesus has vanished. The obvious reason is that black acropolis above Tiberias. Capernaum, where Matthew sat at custom, depended on

¹ Schumacher's survey in the P.E.F. Statement, 1887, pp. 85 ff.

the great road, and faded when commerce took a new direction. But Tiberias, the only defensible site, being at once on the Lake and on a hill, necessarily became the seat of the government of the province, which, in time of course took from it its designation. That is why the name of the foreign emperor, first brought here by a most sordid flattery, is still buried in this obscurity and silence. But Christ went up these roads to rule the world.

Of importance equal to Tiberias was Taricheæ, for according to Pliny,¹ in his day it gave its name to the whole lake; it was a centre of industry and commerce, and in Josephus' time a greater stronghold of Jewish patriotism than almost any other town in Galilee. But there is mystery about Taricheæ. The name is neither mentioned in the Gospels nor found upon the Lake to-day. Till some definite proof be discovered, the site will continue a matter of controversy, for the evidence we have is conflicting. According to one passage in Josephus, in which he speaks of going to Arbela from Tiberias through Taricheæ,² and another in which he describes the campaign of Vespasian against Tiberias and Taricheæ, the latter appears to have lain north of Tiberias. But other passages imply that it lay to the south; it is on the south that Pliny has placed it; and it is there also that it is set by the only certain allusion to it in later times.³

On the whole the balance of the evidence is with those who assign Taricheæ to the peninsula El-Kerak, which was once perhaps an island, and lies just where Jordan issues from the Lake. Here are the ruins of a considerable city and fortifications, and here also—it has been forgotten—is

¹ *Hist. Nat.*, V. 15.

² *Life*, § 60.

³ In a passage hitherto overlooked, on the Jichus ha-Ssaddiqim (of the end of the sixteenth century), which mentions a סראקה, Saraqa, next to the Baths of Tiberias, which looks very like a corruption of Taricheæ. See p. 386 of Carmoly's collection of Itineraries (*Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte des XIII^e-XVII^e siècles*).

the only position on the lake which suits Josephus' description of Taricheæ, as washed on more than one side by the sea.¹

Taricheæ is a Greek word, and means "pickling places," and Strabo says that "at Taricheæ the Lake supplied the best fish for curing."² The pickled fish of Galilee were known throughout the Roman world; not only were large quantities taken up to Jerusalem at the time of the feasts for the numerous multitudes which gathered there, but barrels of them were carried round the Mediterranean. Josephus describes Taricheæ as full of materials for ship-building, and with many artisans.³ The harbour could shelter a fleet of vessels. That so important a place, and moreover one not like Tiberias, official and foreign, but thoroughly Galilean, as Josephus testifies, and a centre of the disciples' own craft, should never be mentioned in the Gospels is singular enough. One can think of no explana-

¹ See Josephus, III. *Wars*, ix. 7 ff. According to this, Vespasian advanced on Tiberias from Scythopolis. He first camped at Sinnabris, a station thirty furlongs from Tiberias, and sent Valerian with a few horse against the city. Valerian was repulsed, but the elders of Tiberias came to offer to surrender it to Vespasian, while the rebels among their townsmen fled to Taricheæ. Vespasian having entered Tiberias, then pitched his camp between that city and Taricheæ. The latter lay "like Tiberias at the foot of a mountain, and there was a plain in front of it." Here a battle took place, and Titus entered the city between the wall and the sea. All this implies a position for Taricheæ north of Tiberias, for if Vespasian was going north, the rebels from Tiberias would scarcely fly in his face; and besides, if Taricheæ was to the south, it must have been in his line of march,—indeed, Sinnabris, where he camped, the present Sinn en Nebra, is but a quarter of a mile from Kerak,—and it is difficult to understand why he did not attack it first. Yet, on the other hand, immediately after these events, we find Vespasian's camp—presumably the same as he had pitched between Tiberias and Taricheæ—at Emmaus, the hot baths to the north of Tiberias (IV. *Wars*, i. 1). Conder's identification of Taricheæ with Takar or Takar-Aar of the Mohar's travels (see his *Handbook*, p. 279) cannot be thought of, for Taricheæ is a Greek name. Nor is Neubauer's identification of Taricheæ the Talmudic בית ירה, which he supposes to have been corrupted to תריה, at all likely; though בית ירה is placed near Sinnabris, probably by the issue of the Jordan (*Géog. du Talmud*, p. 216, cf. with p. 31). Kerak he supposes to be a corruption of קיר ירה=בית ירה. But this is equally unlikely. Much more probable is the hypothesis that Kerak is a reminiscence of Raqqath.

² XVI, ch. ii. § 45.

³ III. *Wars*, ix. 6.

tion except its position at the south-west corner of the Lake, which never seems to have been visited by our Lord and His disciples, which was out of the way of those main roads they naturally selected for their journeys, but at the same time not solitary enough to afford them a retreat. It is not only Taricheæ that is omitted from the Gospels; nothing south of Tiberias is mentioned, neither the Baths nor Sinnabris, nor Taricheæ, nor Homonœa nor Scythopolis.¹

North of Tiberias were Magdala, the present Megdel on the plain of Gennesaret, and Capernaum, Bethsaida and Chorazin, on sites which will probably always remain matters of dispute. Chorazin may be the present Khurbet Kerâseh, northwards from Tell-Hum; or indeed it might be Khersa on the eastern shore, with which both Arculf and Willibald identify it. The controversies between the supporters of Khan Minyeh and those of Tell-Hum for the site of Capernaum and the questions about Bethsaida,² there is no room to discuss. I agree with those who hold that there was but one Bethsaida, that, namely, rebuilt by Philip and called Julias on the eastern bank of the Jordan as it enters the Lake; but I may add to their argument, these two considerations: *First*, when our Lord and His disciples are said to have gone into a boat, and *passed over*, this does not necessarily mean that they crossed the Lake from the eastern to the western coast or *vice versa*; for Josephus speaks of "sailing over" from Tiberias to Taricheæ, though these towns lay on the same side of the Lake.³ To leave the

¹ How little is to be inferred from the silence of the Gospels about places mentioned in Josephus is to be seen from the reverse case of the silence of Josephus about Nazareth. He agitated and fought pretty well all over Galilee, he mentions many villages as obscure as Nazareth, and yet he is silent about the latter.

² The student will find the best summaries in Henderson's *Palestine*, Conder's *Handbook* (supplemented by *Tent Work in Palestine*), in Andrews' *Bible Student's Life of our Lord*, pp. 180-195; or, going further back, Robinson's *Researches*, vol. iii., and *Later Researches*; and Wilson's *Lands of the Bible*, vol. ii.

³ *Life*, § 59.

eastern coast, therefore, and *sail over* to Bethsaida, does not imply a Bethsaida on the western coast. *Second*, though John adds to Bethsaida, that it was *in Galilee*,¹ this need not mean that it lay west of the Jordan, for, as we have seen, the province of Galilee ran right round the Lake,² and included all the level and coast-land on the east. Wherever these three—Capernaum, Bethsaida and Chorazin—may have been, the well-nigh complete obliteration of all of them is remarkable in this, that they were the very three towns which our Saviour emphatically condemned to humiliation. Down the east coast, the city of Gergesa has been identified with the present ruins known as Khersa, at the only portion of that coast where the steep hills come down to the shore. Gamala is found, probably correctly, on the site of the town Kulat-el-Hosn, a long camel's neck of a ridge in the gorge opposite Tiberias. Hippos was the present Susiyeh above the same gorge. Aphek lay a little higher up in the plateau, the present village of Fik. And Gadara, as already noticed, looked up the lake from the heights immediately south of the Yarmuk.

This catalogue of the towns on the Lake of Galilee, if it fail to fix for us the sites of many of them, cannot but force our imagination to realise the almost unbroken line of buildings by which the Lake was surrounded. Of this her coasts still bear the mark. As the Dead Sea is girdled by an almost constant hedge of driftwood, so the Sea of Galilee is girdled by a scarcely less continuous belt of ruins—the drift of her ancient towns.³ In the time of our Lord, she must have mirrored within the outline of her

¹ John's Gospel.

² As the Kad'at Tubariyeh does to-day.

³ "These accumulated fragments, the multitude of towns, and the magnificence of the constructions of which they were proofs, recalled to my mind the road which leads along the foot of Vesuvius from Castellamare to Portici. As there, the borders of the Lake of Gennesareth seem to have borne cities instead of harvests and forests."—*Lamartine*.

guardian hills little else than city-walls, houses, synagogues, wharves and factories.¹ Greek architecture hung its magnificence over her simple life: Herod's castle, temples, and theatres in Tiberias, the bath-houses at Hammath; a hippodrome at Taricheæ; and, farther back from the shore, the high-stacked houses of Gamala; the great amphitheatre in Gadara, looking up the lake with the Acropolis above it, and the paved street with its triumphal archway; the great Greek villas on the heights about Gadara; with a Roman camp or two, high enough up the slopes to catch the western breeze, and daily sending its troops to relieve guard in the cities. All this was what imposed itself upon that simple open-air life on fields and roads and boats, which we see in the Gospels, so sunny and free. Amid the sowing and reaping, the fishing and mending of nets, and the journeying to and fro upon foot, the simple habits of the native life, do we not catch some shadows of that other world, which had grown up around it, in the crowds that are said to grind on one another in the narrow lanes, like corn between millstones;² in the figures of the centurion, the publican and the demoniac, crying that his name was Legion; in the stories of the pulling down of barns and building of greater, of opulent householders leaving their well-appointed villas for a time with every servant in his place, and the porter set to watch, of market-places and *streets*, as well as *lanes*;³ in the comparison of the towns on the Lake to great cities—Sodom and Gomorrha, Tyre and Sidon and Nineveh; in the mention of the sins of a city,⁴ and of Mammon and *all the things after which the Gentiles seek*, and in the acknowledgment that Galilee was a place where a man might *gain the whole world*?⁵

¹ There were tanneries and potteries by the present Ain et Tabighah.

² Mark v. 24: *συνέθλιβον αὐτὸν*; cf. Luke viii. 42: *συνέπριγον αὐτὸν*.

³ "Go ye out into the streets and lanes."

⁴ Luke vii. 37.

⁵ Luke ix. 25.

Twice it has seemed to me that I saw the Lake as it lay in those thronged days. One of these occasions was among the tombs of Gadara. Some peasants had just dug up the gravestone of a Roman soldier, whose name was given—P. Aelius, and that he had lived forty years, and served nineteen; but it also said that he was of a Legion, the Fourteenth. As I read this last detail—and the word is still stamped on other stones in the neighbourhood—I realised how familiar that engine of foreign oppression had been to this district, so that the poor madman could find nothing fitter than it to describe the incubus upon his own life. *My name is Legion, he said, for we are many.* The second occasion was at Fik, as I looked across the site of Gamala and down the gorge, on the Lake and the houses of Tiberias opposite—their squalor glorified in the midday sun. I saw nothing but water and houses, and the sound came over the hill of the bugle of a troop of Turkish horse. It was a glimpse and an echo of that time when Greek cities and Roman camps environed the Lake. Yet only a glimpse; for Gamala should have been stacked with her high houses, and the lake dotted with sails, and on the air there should have been the hum of tens of thousands of a population crowded within a few square miles. The only sound I heard, save the bugle, was of bees. The scene differs from what it was, as much as a wood in winter from a wood in summer, or a bay at ebb from a bay at full tide, when the waters are rushing and the boats are sailing to and fro.

The industries of the Lake of Galilee were agriculture and fruit-growing; dyeing and tanning, with every department of a large carrying trade; but chiefly fishing, boat-building and fish-curing. Of the last, which spread the lake's fame over the Roman world, before its fishermen and their habits became familiar through the Gospel, there is no trace in the Evangelists. The fisheries themselves

were pursued by thousands of families. They were no monopoly ; but the fishing grounds, best at the north end of the Lake where the streams entered, were free to all. And the trade was very profitable.

It was in the ranks of them who pursued this free and hardy industry that Christ looked for His disciples. Not wealthy, they were yet independent, with no servile tempers about them ; and with no private or trade wrongs disadjusting their consciences. This was one of the reasons for which our Lord chose them. In that age it would have been easy to gather, as David did into the cave of Adullam, all that were in debt, or in distress or discontented, or had run away from their masters. But such would not have been the men to preach a spiritual gospel, the coming not of a national, but of a universal kingdom. Men brought up, however justly, to feel the wrongs of their class or their trade before anything else, would have been of no use to Christ. Just as futile would those "innovators" have proved, whom Josephus describes to have so largely composed the population of Galilee. Christ went to a trade which had no private wrongs : and called men not from their dreams, but from work they were contented to do from day to day, till something higher should touch them. And so it has come to pass that not the jargon of the fanatics and brigands in the highlands of Galilee, but the speech of the fishermen of her Lake, and the paraphernalia of their craft have become the language and symbolism of the world's religion.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

SOME POINTS IN THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM.

IV. THE AUTHORSHIP AND COMPOSITION OF THE THIRD GOSPEL.

IF the authorship of any of the Gospels can be considered established, or even if there should seem to be a high degree of probability for a particular view on this head, our theories as to the character and method of the composition must necessarily be thereby affected. The opportunities of information possessed by the writer in question, and the manner in which he would be likely to do his work, will then have to be taken into account. There can be no doubt that the well-attested tradition with respect to the composition of the Second Gospel by St. Mark and his relation to St. Peter, has powerfully influenced the minds of many critics who cannot be accused of bias towards orthodox or conservative opinions. In like manner, if it can be shown that the writer of the Third Gospel was a companion of St. Paul who visited Palestine within less than thirty years after our Lord's crucifixion, this is not only a point of great importance to us in forming our estimate of the historical value of his record, but it will also be full of suggestiveness as to the way in which the materials for it were probably obtained; while it will help, as the belief that St. Mark was the author of the Second Gospel does, to give a life and reality to our speculations on the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, which the subject often lacks, so long as our attention is confined to the evidence supplied by a comparison of the order and phraseology of their narratives.

Now it appears to me that the authorship of the Third Gospel is a question capable of definite settlement to an extent that few others connected with the synoptic problem are. And it has the further significance that it involves

the determination also of the authorship of the Acts of the Apostles.

The argument to which I am about to appeal is linguistic; and considerations of this nature are apt to be very precarious. Linguistic phenomena may be and often are diversely interpreted, if they are limited in amount. But the mass of peculiarities of diction may be so great that this kind of evidence becomes as irrefragable as any other kind could be.

The conclusion that the Third Gospel and the Acts were put forth by the same writer is a case in point. The similarities of style and vocabulary between these two works are such as to have convinced critics of all schools of this.¹ It may be taken as one of the ascertained facts of modern critical inquiry. In judging of the characteristics in question, the other books of the New Testament afford a convenient standard of comparison. The Third Gospel and the Acts have (1) a very large number of words and constructions in common, which are not found elsewhere in the New Testament, and (2) a very large number which are decidedly rarer in the rest of the New Testament than in these two works, either absolutely or in proportion to the extent of the writings compared. The difference may in part be stated by saying that the style of these two works is on the whole more truly Greek and less Hebraic than the rest of the New Testament. And it may, perhaps, be suggested that if the two writings were the work of two men drawn from the class of fairly educated Gentile or Hellenistic converts, the apparent effect would be the same. But the peculiarities are too numerous for such an explanation, which in itself would not be a very probable one. They

¹ Comp., for example, Zeller, *The Acts of the Apostles*, Eng. Trans., II. p. 213. "In the present case the identity of the author of the two writings is raised to such a height of probability that we have every right to consider it historically proved."

include many instances which must rank as the idiosyncrasies of an individual.

This is not by any means the only sign of identity of authorship in the case of these two writings, but it is the one which least of all admits of being mistaken through any personal prepossessions. The purely linguistic facts are as definite as facts well could be. And seeing that the inference naturally drawn from them is confirmed by all the more general indications of intellectual temper and religious point of view to be observed in each, the practical unanimity of critics on this subject is not surprising.

Let the precise words, however, which I have used be noted. I have spoken of the conclusion that the Third Gospel and the Acts were *put forth* by the same writer. That he used materials, documentary or oral, in both books is commonly maintained, and should indeed be freely admitted on all hands. The agreement to which I have referred extends only to the point that one and the same writer put into shape and left his impress upon these two compositions, so that he must not only have arranged, but in many cases have worked over, the narratives which he adopted from different sources.

Now, as every one who has read the Acts of the Apostles with any attention knows, there are certain passages occurring in the latter part of the book in which the first person plural is adopted,¹ whereby it is plainly implied that the narrator was himself present when the events described happened. The question of the authorship of the Acts (which, as we have seen, carries with it that of the Third Gospel) turns on the character of these sections and their relation to the rest of the work. It is certainly the most obvious view to take, (1) that the writer who here employs the first person plural was what he professes to be, a companion of St. Paul who went with him on the occasion of

¹ Acts xvi. 10-17; xx. 5-15; xxi. 1-18; xxvii. 1-xxviii. 16.

his last journey to Palestine ; (2) that he who in these sections is the narrator of events at which he himself was present, is also the author of the book as a whole. Those, however, to whom the conclusion which follows from these two propositions is unwelcome have denied either the one or the other of them. (1) There are some who have suggested that while the author of the "we" sections is the author of the whole work, he introduced the first person plural in order to give authority to his book, though he belonged to a later generation than St. Paul or any of his companions. But clear-sighted naturalistic critics, like, for example, Zeller, have perceived the impossibility of maintaining this position. For, to say nothing of the difficulty of reconciling this dishonesty with the general impression of the writer's character which we derive from his two works, if he had had this object, he would certainly not have contented himself with claiming the character of an eye-witness so unobtrusively in these few places. Accordingly Zeller and others hold that these sections formed portions of a genuine diary of travel written by a companion of St Paul, which the author of the Acts, a writer of a later generation, made use of ; and that this later writer left the first person plural standing mainly through carelessness, though he may also have been influenced in some degree by the consciousness that it would be effective for the purpose of gaining credence for his work.

In reply it has been rightly urged that it would have been more natural for the historian who so completely appropriated this material to remove, when he did so, these marks of another hand. It is true the mediæval chronicles supply instances of fragments taken from other authors who speak plainly in their own person, which are crudely introduced by the later writer without any attempt to produce consistency. But the author of the Acts was a man

of higher literary aims and qualifications.¹ The signs also which there undoubtedly are in the style of these sections, that he at least edited them on incorporating them into his work, must increase the improbability that he would have allowed the personal pronoun, which belonged to another than himself, to remain.

It is by a comparison of the style of these passages with that of the rest of the Acts that the question before us must mainly be decided. Now the homogeneity of style in the whole work, and the natural inference from it that the narrator who accompanied St. Paul on the journeys recorded in the later chapters of the book was the author of the whole, have been strongly asserted by many who have given attention to the subject, as, for example, by Lekebusch.² The opinion of Renan may also be quoted. After saying that "it is beyond doubt that the Acts had the same author as the Third Gospel," he proceeds: "A second proposition which is not so certain, but which one may nevertheless regard as highly probable, is that the author of the Acts is a disciple of Paul who accompanied him on a good part of his travels." . . . "One is driven irresistibly to the conclusion that he who wrote the end of the work wrote also its beginning, and that the narrator of the whole is the same who says 'we' in the passages that have been already cited."³ It may be added that Bishop Lightfoot, after referring to this judgment by Renan, as given here and also in another work, expresses his own conviction that the view that St. Luke was the author, "will be the final verdict of the future, as it has been the unbroken tradition of the past."⁴

Zeller, however, also recognises that traces of the same

¹ Cf. Lekebusch, *Die Composition und Entstehung der Apostelgeschichte*, pp. 186-8.

² *Ib.*, p. 79.

³ *Les Apôtres*, pp. x., xi.

⁴ *Essays on Supernatural Religion*. Appendix, p. 291.

hand are to be found throughout the whole of the Acts in such wise that "we have to regard the book as the work of one author, who has impressed upon it a definite stamp of style and composition."¹ And yet he supposes him in the "we" sections to have discharged only the part of an editor.

So far as I know the attempt has not hitherto been made on either side to bring these opposite views to a definite test. The possibility of Zeller's explanation being true would seem clearly to depend on the number of the "Lucan" characteristics (as I may for brevity call them) in the "we" sections being comparatively small. It would be inconceivable that a mere editor should, especially in that age, have virtually rewritten the passages.

Now it has occurred to me to examine these passages word by word, and phrase by phrase, comparing the usage of the remainder of the Acts, of the Third Gospel, and of the rest of the New Testament, except in the case of such very common words as must be constantly employed by every writer, and to tabulate the facts. The result was to afford what, I must confess, appears to me to be an irresistible demonstration that the original writer of these sections is the person who has put forth the Acts as a whole. I did not anticipate that an argument so convincing could be furnished by such an inquiry.

For the sake of definiteness it is best to take as the basis of comparison the exact passages in which the first person plural occurs.² But I must not be understood to mean that the narrator is recording what he himself saw and heard only in these passages. There are portions, at all events, of the contexts of these passages where there would have been no opportunity for the introduction of the first person

¹ *Theol. Jahrb.*, 1851, p. 187.

² See the references p. 338, n. 1.

plural, or no necessity for it, even though he was present. I must further explain that the first three of the sections referred to are the best suited for our purpose. The fourth, owing to the peculiarity of the subject—the account of St. Paul's voyage and shipwreck—is full of words which occur there, and there only, either in the "Lucan" writings or elsewhere in the New Testament. The occurrence of these tells neither for nor against the thesis that the narrator is the author of the "Lucan" writings in general, and they necessarily leave less room for characteristics which would be to the point. Even in the three others there are peculiar words which have to be set on one side as being due to the speciality of the subject or occasion. Nevertheless so far as the fourth and longest passage is capable of being brought into court, it supports the evidence of the three earlier ones.

The space at my disposal does not allow me to give here the tables which I have made for all the passages. I must content myself with exemplifying all by means of the first; and when I have done this I will state the general results. That one of which I give the analysis is not more favourable to my argument than the others. In the left hand column I have given at length the verses examined, in order that the proportion of the characteristic words to the rest, and the nature of the latter (many of them words necessarily common to all writers, others proper names) may be seen at a glance. I have also placed the translation of the Revised Version under the Greek words for the convenience of readers not familiar with the Greek. Where the point to be compared is the construction, or some special sense of a word, I have indicated this in a bracket; but where the frequency of occurrence of the word (not of course always in the same tense or case) is all that is to be noted, I have simply given the numbers. The columns after the first give the usage in the various divisions. In

the last of them it is worthy of remark when most or all the instances occur in a particular writer. His special subject may then account for many of them, or he may have shared the peculiarity in question with the author of the Acts. A good many instances occurring thus in a single other writer will detract less from our impression that the usage in question was a "Lucan" characteristic, than if they were more scattered.

Words which occur but once are, as I have already said, not to the purpose of the argument, but I have put 0's in the succeeding columns as the simplest way of indicating these ἀπαξ λεγόμενα.

Some instances have probably escaped my notice; but I believe that the following table and the summary at the end of it will be found approximately true, and that any corrections which may be required will not suffice to affect the general result.

Acts xvi. 10-17.	" We " sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
ὡς δὲ <i>and when</i>	8	20	1	6 (5 of them being in the Fourth Gospel).
[comp. other uses of ὡς as a temporal conjunction]	0	1	18	12 (11 in Fourth Gospel, ὡς οὖν, which is peculiar to it, being common).
τὸ ὄραμα <i>the vision</i> εἶδεν <i>he had seen</i> εὐθέως ἐζητήσαμεν ἐξελθεῖν <i>eis Μακεδονίαν</i> <i>straightway we sought to go forth into Macedonia</i>	2	9 For the whole phrase τὸ ὄραμα εἶδεν cf. x. 17; xi. 5; xii. 9.	0	1

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
συνβιβάζοντες <i>concluding</i> ὅτι <i>that</i>	1	2 [in ix. 22 approximately in same sense; in xix. 33 a different sense.	0	4 (but sense different from either of those in the Acts; all in Epp. of St. Paul).
προσκέκληται <i>had called</i> (of Divine call)	1	2 (xiii. 2 is a specially close parallel).	0	0
ἡμᾶς ὁ Θεὸς <i>us God</i> εὐαγγελίσασθαι αὐτοὺς <i>for to preach the Gospel unto them</i> (accusative of those evangelised)	1	5	2	2
ἀναχθέντες <i>setting sail</i> (in this meaning)	10 (frequency explained by subject).	3	1	0
(other meanings)	0	4	3	3
οὖν ἀπὸ Τρωάδος <i>therefore from Troas</i>	2	0	0	0
εὐθυδρομήσαμεν <i>we made a straight course</i>				
εἰς Ξαμοθράκην <i>to Samothrace</i>				
τῇ δὲ ἐπιούσῃ <i>and the day following</i>	3	2	0	0
εἰς Νέαν πόλιν <i>to Neapolis</i>				
κακεῖθεν <i>and from thence</i> (comp. κακεῖ, which is also characteristic)	6	3	0	0

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
ἣτις ἐστὶν πρώτη <i>which is the first</i>				
τῆς μερίδος <i>of the district</i>	1	1	1	2
Μακεδονίας πόλις <i>a city of Macedonia</i>				
κολωνία <i>a Roman colony</i>	1	0	0	0
Ἔμμεν δε <i>and we were</i> (substantive verb with participle)	5	favourite construction.	do.	much less common.
ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ πόλει <i>in this city</i>				
διατρίβοντες <i>tarrying</i>	2	7	0	2 (both in Fourth Gospel).
ἡμέρας τινάς <i>certain days</i> (διατρίβειν, with accus. of period)	2	4	0	0
τῇ τε ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων <i>and on the Sabbath day</i> (ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββ. or τῶν σαββ.)	1	1	4	0 (John xix.31 is not an instance).
ἐξῆλθομεν ἔξω τῆς πόλης παρὰ ποταμὸν <i>we went forth without the gate by a riverside</i>				
οὗ <i>where</i>	4	5	6	12
ἐνομιζομεν <i>we supposed</i>	1	6	2	6
προσευχὴν <i>place of prayer</i> (special sense)	2	0	0	0
εἶναι <i>there was</i> [This construction of the acc. with infin. after				

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
νομίζω is also characteristic. See <i>Lekebusch</i> , p. 76.]				
καὶ <i>and</i>				
καθίσαντες ἐλαλοῦμεν <i>we sat down and spake</i> (participle joined with verb to picture the position of a speaker or actor)	2	favourite form of construction. See <i>Lekebusch</i> , p. 76.	do.	
ταῖς συνελθούσαις γυναῖξιν <i>unto the women which were come together.</i> (Close parallels to the phrase as a whole) (Verb, συνέρχεσθαι)	2	see i. 21; and x. 27. 15	2	13 (5 being in Gospels and 8 in 1st Ep. to Cor., mostly in one passage).
καὶ τις γυνή <i>And a certain woman</i> (τις before the word which it qualifies)	4	11	3	23
ὀνόματι <i>named</i>	4	18	5	2
Λυδία <i>Lydia</i>				
πορφυρόπωλις <i>a seller of purple</i>	1	0	0	0
πόλεως Θιατείρων <i>of the city of Thyateira</i> (πόλις in apposition with name of city, and preceding it)	2	1	1	0
σεβομένη <i>one that worshipped</i> (the participle, name for proselytes)	1	5	0	0

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
τὸν θεόν, ἤκουεν, ἧς ὁ κύριος God, heard us, whose the Lord.				
διήνοιξεν τὴν καρδίαν opened heart.				
(metaph. of heart or mind	1	0	2	0
„ of scriptures	0	1	1	0
non-metaph.)	0	1	1	2
προσέχειν τοῖς λαλουμένοις ὑπο Παύλου to give heed unto the things which were spoken by Paul		cf. close parallel at viii. 6.		
(τὰ λαλούμενα, λαληθέντα, and λεγόμενα; the making of a substantive out of a participle is in itself characteristic)	3	3	4	2
ὡς δὲ and when (see above)				
ἐβαπτίσθη καὶ she was baptised and				
ὁ οἶκος αὐτῆς her household		x. 2, xi. 14, xvi. 31, xviii. 8, are close parallels, such as are not elsewhere found.		
παρεκάλεσεν λέγουσα she besought us, saying εἰ κεκρίκατέ με πιστὴν τῷ Κυρίῳ εἶναι if ye have judged me to be faithful to the Lord		comp. xiii. 4, 6.		
εἰσελθόντες εἰς τὸν οἶκόν μου μένετε come into my house and abide there.				

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
καὶ παρεβιάσατο <i>And she constrained</i>	1	0	1	0
ἡμᾶς. <i>us.</i>				
ἐγένετο δὲ <i>And it came to pass</i> (Elsewhere we have καὶ ἐγένετο, which more exactly corresponds to the Hebrew phrase. The Third Gospel has this also many times, perhaps from the influence of the parallels; it is rare in the Acts, and does not occur after the first few chapters.)	4	12	17	0
(Construction with the infin. following is also characteristic):— πορευομένων ἡμῶν εἰς τὴν προσευχὴν παιδίσκην τινὰ ἔχουσαν πνεῦμα <i>As we were going to the place of prayer that a certain maid having a spirit</i>	3	10	3	0
πύθωνα <i>of divination</i>	1	0	0	0
ὑπαντῆσαι ἡμῖν, ἧτις <i>met us which</i>				
ἐργασίαν πολλὴν παρέχειν <i>brought much gain</i> (ἐργασία, παρέχειν)	1 2	comp. xix. 24. 3 3	1 4	1 7
τοῖς κυρίοις αὐτῆς <i>to her masters</i>				
μαντευομένην <i>by soothsaying.</i>	1	0	0	0

Acts xvi. 10-17.	"We" sections.	Remainder of Acts.	Third Gospel.	Rest of New Testament.
αὕτη <i>The same</i>				
κατακολουθοῦσα <i>following after</i>	1	0	1	0
τῷ Παύλῳ καὶ ἡμῖν ἔκραζεν λέγουσα, Οὗτοι οἱ ἄνθρωποι δοῦλοι <i>Paul and us, cried out saying, These men the servants</i>				
τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου <i>of the most high God</i> (comp. ὁ ὑψιστος)	1	0	1	2
εἰσίν, οἵτινες <i>are, who</i>	0	1	4	0
καταγγέλλουσιν <i>proclaim</i>	1	10	0	7 (all in Epp. of St. Paul).
ὑμῖν <i>unto you</i>				
ὁδὸν σωτηρίας <i>the way of salvation</i> (ἡ ὁδος, etc., as designa- tion of Christian faith and practice.)	1	8	0	0

I must leave any of my readers who care to do so to pursue the investigation for themselves; and must content myself with conveying as well as I can by a few general statements the impression which the tabulation of the facts, if completed, would make. I have counted no less than 39 characteristic words or constructions in Acts xvi. 10-17; 39 in xx. 5-15; 33 in xxi. 1-18. Moreover, in this reckoning I have not taken account of the general fondness displayed for participles, and for their accumulation, and for compound verbs, which could not be numerically represented.

Again, among the words characteristic of the "Lucan"

writings, some are not even in them very numerous; yet one or more instances of many of these occur in the "we" sections.

Once more, in the case of many of the "Lucan" words and phrases noted, the ratio of the number of times that they occur in these sections to the number of times that they are found elsewhere in the Acts is much greater than the ratio of the length of the sections in question to that of the remainder of the work.

It has often been remarked that the proportion of "Lucan" phrases in the Acts is considerably greater than in the Third Gospel, and that this is accounted for by the larger use in the latter of the writing or the words of others. A further following out of such investigations as I have indicated might reveal similar differences within the Acts of the Apostles itself. But, at all events, the evidence which I have adduced and referred to can leave no doubt that the "we" sections were the original composition of the general author. The "Lucan" characteristics form the very warp and woof of their style.

The authenticity of the Acts has, I am aware, been attacked on the ground of alleged historical discrepancies between this work and the Epistles of St. Paul, and secular historians. But even when the most is made of these apparent inconsistencies, they are not surely greater than would be found to exist between different trustworthy accounts of the same events, contemporary with the events which they relate, in all periods of history, or in our own times. Objections of this nature cannot countervail the linguistic facts to which attention has been called—facts not one whit less remarkable than those which have won virtually universal agreement for the proposition that the Acts and the Gospel are by the same author.

I consider it, therefore, certain that the composition of the Acts, and consequently, also, of the Third Gospel, is the

work of a companion of St. Paul, who visited Palestine with him, and left it in his company, and who may, therefore, have spent the whole or a considerable part of the interval in that country.¹ This being established, the universal tradition of the Church, that this companion was St. Luke, will readily be accepted, though that is a matter of secondary importance.

This fact—as I will unhesitatingly call it, challenging examination and refutation of the line of argument which I have indicated—this fact as to the position and the opportunities of the author of the Third Gospel ought to be borne in mind in all the theories that we frame about its composition. It would be most likely that such a writer would make large use of information collected by himself, and he clearly implies that he has done so (Luke i. 1-4). And the phenomena of his Gospel are, I venture to think, far more reasonably explained in this manner than either by the “Two-document” hypothesis, or the “Three-document” hypothesis, if I may be allowed to coin a name for the view to which Dr. Weiss, Dr. Ewald and Dr. Sanday incline.²

Whether the design either of the Third Gospel or the Acts of the Apostles had already dawned upon his mind when he visited Palestine in St. Paul’s company, we cannot say. But as he was evidently a man of a literary turn, he may early have begun the practice of keeping a diary of his journeyings with the Apostle, and may have formed the habit of recording matters of interest relating to the history of the Faith which he learned from others, for his own satisfaction if for no other purpose. During his stay in Palestine he would make inquiries both as to the life of our Lord and the history of the Church in the first years after Pentecost. And he might transcribe portions of the written

¹ The time of their arrival was most probably the summer of A.D. 58, and of their departure the autumn of A.D. 60.

² See *EXPOSITOR* for March, p. 181.

accounts of discourses, sayings, and events, which were beginning to be made. Whether he ever was in Palestine again we do not know; but he must have met many Palestinian Christians in other parts of the world who had travelled in the same way that Jews had long been accustomed to do, or who had been scattered through the troubles in Palestine, and who could give him highly reliable, and some of them first-hand, information concerning "those matters which had been fulfilled" in the generation which was passing away. There is, as I have said, strong reason to believe that St. Luke made use of the Gospel according to St. Mark. The latter probably wrote soon after St. Peter's death, say about A.D. 65; St. Luke's work may be placed soon after A.D. 70.¹ He felt that he possessed much additional information which deserved to be recorded, and which, no less than his predecessor's narrative, was derived from "eye-witnesses of the word." A considerable portion of this additional matter is peculiar to St. Luke's Gospel, and there can be absolutely no reason to suppose that it is not the fruit of his own collection of material. The Third Gospel contains however, as we have seen, a certain number of passages which are almost word for word the same as passages in the First Gospel,² while for the most part the context and setting in these very instances are quite dissimilar in the two Gospels. The most natural account in these cases seems to be that there must ultimately here be documentary links between the two, but that the written accounts in question passed into the two Gospels by different courses. They had been obtained by St. Luke in a fragmentary form independently, and without the

¹ The more exact correspondence between his record of the prophecy of the siege and the actual events, as compared with the parallels in the other Gospels, seems to be most naturally explained on the hypothesis that the fulfilment of the prophecy had given precision to his version of the language used. Luke xix. 43, and xxi. 20.

² See *EXPOSITOR* for March, p. 189.

knowledge of the manner in which they were arranged by St. Matthew. In a still larger number of passages, in which the first and third Evangelists give narratives and discourses that are in substance the same, there is no need to assume any common written element. Indeed the amount of differences seems to point clearly to the view that, though St. Luke may have derived what he gives from documentary records, these records and those contained or used in the First Gospel were the embodiment of the original oral accounts by different hands.

I have only professed in these papers to consider "some points in the Synoptic problem." I am not prepared to enter at present into the discussion of the difficult question of the composition of the First Gospel and its relation to a Hebrew original, and I am therefore unwilling to express any opinion upon the subject.

V. H. STANTON.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

V. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS—ITS AIM.

THIS Epistle is distinguished from those already considered belonging to the same group by broadly marked characteristics. In the first place it is more placid in tone. If it be indeed a contribution to the vindication of Paul's Gentile gospel against Judaism, it contains few traces of the controversial spirit. Polemic passes into calm didactic statement. Then, secondly, while the present Epistle contains much in common with the Epistle to the Galatians, we find that the same truths are set forth here in a more expanded and elaborate form. In the third place, to the old materials amplified the Epistle adds a new phase of Pauline thought, in the important section in which an

endeavour is made to reconcile the Apostle's views of Christianity with the prerogatives of Israel as an elect people. This section, consisting of chapters ix.-xi., if not the most important, is at least the most distinctive part of the Epistle, presenting what has not inappropriately been called Paul's philosophy of history.

It is natural to assume that these characteristics are due to the circumstances amidst which the Epistle was written. The historical spirit of modern exegesis does not readily acquiesce in the view which, up till the time of Baur, had been almost universally accepted, that the Epistle to the Romans, unlike the Epistles to the Galatian and Corinthian Churches, is a purely didactic treatise on Christian theology, for which no other occasion need be sought than the desire of the writer to give a full connected statement of the faith as he conceived it. More and more it has been felt that such a production is hardly what we expect from an apostle, and that however didactic or systematic it may appear, the Epistle in question must have been, not less than its companion Epistles, an occasional writing.

There are indeed still those who lean to the old traditional opinion, and seek the initiative, not in any outward circumstances, whether of the Church at Rome, or of the Church generally, but solely in the Apostle's mind, and in his wish to draw up an adequate statement of the Christian faith. Among these is Godet, certainly a most worthy representative of the class, in all whose commentaries one discovers that faculty of psychological divination which is the sure mark of exegetical genius, and whose exposition of *Romans* cannot be charged with the "oppressive monotony"¹ that has been complained of as characterising expository treatises on this Epistle written in the interest of dogmatic

¹ Mangold speaks of the *drückende Monotonie* of the dogmatic commentaries. Vide his *Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde*, p. 20 (1866).

theology. Godet's idea is that Paul was in the habit of giving such developed teaching as we find in *Romans* to all the Churches he had founded, and that he wrote an Epistle to the Church in Rome simply in order to give, in a written form, to an important body of Christians with which he had not come into personal contact, the instruction which he had given *vivâ voce* to the Churches in Ephesus, Thessalonica, Corinth, etc.¹ This is an assumption which readily suggests itself to minds familiar with theological systems, and accustomed to regard all the doctrines of an elaborate creed as essential elements of the faith. But the position is one which it is easier to assume than to prove. Godet offers no proof, but contents himself with referring to a work by Thiersch, published nearly fifty years ago, which, by mistake, he represents as having very solidly demonstrated the Apostle's practice to have been as alleged.² The assertion that the Epistle to the Romans is only a sample of the writer's ordinary teaching stands very much in need of proof. The presumption is all the other way. The two Epistles to the Thessalonians, we have seen, supply evidence to the contrary, and the occasional character of the Epistles to the Galatians and the Corinthians, which contain more advanced teaching, justifies the inference that the Epistle to the Romans also is an occasional writing containing special instruction called for by exceptional and urgent circumstances. To this it must be added that the whole notion of Godet and those who agree with him is not easily reconcilable with a just conception of the apostolic vocation and temper. An apostle is in spirit and mental habit a very different man from a systematic theologian.

¹ *Commentaire sur l'épître aux Romains*, vol. i. pp. 122, 123.

² *Commentaire*, vol. i. p. 120. The work of Thiersch referred to is *Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts für die Kritik der neutestamentlichen Schriften* (1845). Thiersch distinctly states that the Epistle to the Romans was called forth by the controversy with the Judaists. *Vide* p. 235 of the above-named work.

He deals in inspirations rather than in laborious theological reflection. He has neither the time nor the patience for system building. He may have in his mind many deep thoughts, but he keeps them till they are wanted. He utters his thoughts under constraint of urgent need. He speaks rather than writes, because speaking is more spontaneous than writing; and when he writes it is *currente calamo*, and under pressure of emergent demands.

What the precise situation, in all its details, was, which Paul had in view, when he wrote this Epistle, it may be difficult, or even impossible, to determine. But of one thing it does seem possible to be assured; viz., that the Epistle belongs to the literature, and deals with a phase of, the Judaistic controversy. One could even tell *a priori* what phase it must be with which the last of the controversial group of Epistles is occupied. Already Paul has discussed two aspects of the great quarrel, those relating to the perpetual obligation of the Jewish law, and the qualifications for the apostleship. The one topic remaining to be taken up is the prerogative or primacy of Israel. Without doubt it must have its turn. It had its own proper place in the dialectics of the debate, and it may be taken for granted that a dispute so keen about matters so vital will not stop till it has run its natural course. The fire will burn till the fuel is exhausted. The rapid development of Gentile Christianity made it inevitable that the question should arise, What does the existing state of matters mean? Gentiles are pouring in increasing numbers into the Church. Jews, with comparatively few exceptions, are holding aloof in sullen unbelief: are these facts to be construed as a cancelling of Israel's election; or if the election stands, does it not necessarily involve the illegitimacy of Gentile Christianity? The question may have suggested itself to some of the more reflecting at the very commencement of the Gentile movement, and to Paul

especially it may have been all along clear that it must come to the front ere long, but it could not become a burning question till conversions from heathendom had taken place on a great scale. The first effort of the Judaist would naturally be to nip the new departure in the bud, by compelling Gentile converts to comply with Jewish customs. The next would be to cripple a movement which could not be crushed by disputing the apostolic standing and assailing the character of its leader. When both attempts had been rendered futile, by the triumphant progress of the movement in spite of all opposition, the only course open would be to enter a protest in the name of the elect people, and pronounce the evangelisation of the Gentiles a wrong done to Israel.

It is to the temper which would enter such a protest, or to any extent sympathise with it, that Paul addresses himself in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. That this part of the Epistle at least has to do with the final phase of the Judaistic opposition to a free independent Christianity I take to be self-evident. The only thing that may seem open to doubt is whether it was worth while taking any notice of the sullen mood of the men who were disaffected, and out of sympathy with the cause Paul had so much at heart. Could he not have afforded to treat it with contempt as utterly impotent? For what could the protesters do; what would they be at? They had no practicable programme to propose. Could they seriously wish the work of Gentile evangelisation to be stopped till the bulk of the Jewish people had been converted to the faith, insisting on the principle *the Jew first*, not merely in the sense that the Jew should get the first offer, but in the sense that all the world must wait till the Jews *en masse* accepted the offer? If they had not the hardihood to make so absurd a demand, there was no course open to them but to accept the situa-

tion and reconcile themselves with the best grace possible to accomplished facts.

Had Paul been a man of the world, he might have adopted the attitude of silent contempt. But being a man of truly Christlike spirit, he could not so treat any class of men bearing however unworthily the Christian name. He knew well that a disaffected party was none the less formidable that it was conscious of defeat, and had no outlook for the future; that in such a case chronic alienation and ultimate separation were to be apprehended. He would do his utmost to prevent such a disaster. And it is obvious in what spirit such a delicate task must be gone about to have any chance of success. An irenic and generous tone was indispensable. No bitter irritating words must be indulged in, but only such thoughts and language employed as tended to enlighten, soothe, and conciliate. The Epistle to the Romans fully meets these requirements by an entire absence of the controversial style. It has been customary to explain this feature of the Epistle by the fact of its having been written to a Church with which Paul had no personal relations, and this may count for something. But there is a deeper and a worthier reason for the contrast in tone between this Epistle and those written to the Galatian and Corinthian Churches. The whole situation is changed. Then Paul was fighting for existence with his back to the wall, now he writes as one conscious that the cause of Gentile Christianity is safe. Therefore while careful to do justice to his convictions, he expresses himself throughout as one who can afford to be generous. Thus in chapters ix.-xi., while maintaining that God had the right to disinherit Israel (ix.), and that she had fully deserved such a doom (x.), he declares the disinheritance to be only temporary and remedial, and anticipates a time when Jew and Gentile shall be united by a common faith in Christ (xi.). Then he not only abstains personally from a tone of triumph

in speaking of unbelieving Israel, but he earnestly warns the Gentile members of the Roman Church from indulging in a boastful spirit.¹ And the irenical tone, conspicuous in these three chapters, pervades the whole Epistle. In the first eight chapters stern things are said about Jewish moral shortcomings, and Judaism judged by its results is pronounced not less a failure than heathenism.² At the same time it is admitted that the Jewish people possessed eminent and valuable religious distinctions.³ Similar is the treatment of the Jewish law. While it is declared to be of no value for the attainment of righteousness, not less peremptorily than in the Epistle to the Galatians, its ethical worth is recognised with a frankness which we miss in the earlier Epistle.⁴

The situation as above described explains not only the calm irenical didactic tone of the Epistle, but also its broad comprehensive method. At first sight it seems as if it were top-heavy. If the writer's aim be to deal with a new Judaistic objection to Gentile Christianity, based on the prerogative of Israel, why not content himself with making the statement in chapters ix.-xi.? To what purpose that elaborate argumentative exposition of the Gospel as he understood it in the first eight chapters?

Baur's answer to this question was in effect that these eight chapters are an introduction to the next three, which form the proper kernel of the Epistle.⁵ I do not accept this statement as altogether satisfactory, though I frankly own that I would rather regard the three chapters as the *kernel*, than relegate them to the subordinate position assigned them by the dogmatic school of interpreters, that of a mere *appendix*. But the truth is that these famous chapters are neither kernel nor appendix, but an integral part of one great whole. They deal with a question of national privi-

¹ Rom. xi. 16-21.

² Rom. ii.

³ Rom. iii. 1, 2.

⁴ Rom. vii. 12.

⁵ *Paulus der Apostel*, i. 351.

lege. But there is a previous question involved, that as to the claims of Christianity. For the position taken up by opponents virtually is, the rights of Israel *versus* the rights of universal Christianity. The proper antithesis to that is, the rights of Christianity first, and Israel's rights only in the second place, and as far as compatible with the supreme interests of the true religion. The Epistle to the Romans is devoted to the advocacy of this position, the first eight chapters dealing with the larger, more general claims of Christianity, the next three dealing with the less important narrower question as to the real value of Israel's claim. Obviously both sections of the Epistle are essential to the purpose in hand. And that purpose guides the course of the Apostle's thought throughout. In brief what he says is this: Christianity is in its nature a universal religion. It is needed by the world at large, by Gentiles and by Jews alike. For both heathenism and Judaism, judged by their practical results, are failures. Christianity is not a failure. It solves the problem aimed at by all religion; brings men into blessed relations with God, and makes them really righteous. Christianity therefore must have free course: no prescriptive rights can be allowed to stand in its way. As for the Jewish people I am heartily sorry for them. They are my countrymen, they are also God's people. But their right is not absolute, and they deserve to forfeit it. Yet I do not believe they are permanently doomed to forfeiture. God will continue to love them, and in the course of His beneficent providence will give effect to their claims in a way compatible with Christian universalism and with Gentile interests.

Thus by a train of thought of which the foregoing is the gist, does Paul storm the last stronghold of Judaists without ever mentioning their name. The absence of any allusion to Judaistic opponents in the Epistle has been adduced as a reason for calling in question its connection with

the Judaistic controversy. The writer, we are told, betrays preoccupation in the treatment of his subject, but it is not relative to Judeo-Christians, or to Judaisers, but to the Jews and to Jewish incredulity.¹ As if the one reference excluded the other! The only effective way to meet Judaistic antagonism to Gentile Christianity in its final phase, was to form a just estimate of the true value of the pretensions of the Jewish people based on their national religion and their covenanted relation to God. It is in harmony with the irenic spirit of our Epistle that this is done without making the controversial reference manifest.

But if Judaistic tendencies were the real though hidden foe, where were they to be found? Within the Church of Rome; or without, and threatening to invade that church and work mischief there as elsewhere; or merely in Paul's own mind, prompt to conceive new possible forms of antagonism, and restless till it had seen its way to intellectual victory over these, and found solutions of all religious problems arising out of the Pauline conception of Christianity? All three views have found influential advocates, and it is by no means easy to decide confidently between them. As to the last of the three, which has been adopted by Weiss,² there is no objection to be taken to it on theoretical or *a priori* grounds. As I have already stated in the second article of the present series, I believe that Paul was his own severest critic, and that he did not need external antagonism to indicate to him the weak points of his religious theory, or to suggest the relative apologetic problems, and that when once these presented themselves, both his reason and his conscience would imperiously demand solutions. Of these problems the last to suggest itself might well be that relating to Jewish prerogative, as it naturally arose out of the extensive development of

¹ So Oltramare, *Commentaire sur l'épître aux Romains* (1831), vol. i. p. 48.

² *Vide* his *Introduction to the New Testament*, vol. i. p. 306.

Gentile Christianity. And it is not inconceivable that when Paul had thought himself clear on this final apologetic topic, he might feel an impulse to reduce his thoughts to writing, and in doing so to work out in literary form his whole religious philosophy from that point of view, and so "bring as it were the spiritual product of the last years to his own consciousness."¹ Nor does it seem incredible that he might send such a writing in epistolary form to the Roman Church without any urgent external occasion, simply because he deemed it fitting that a church presumably Gentile for the most part in its membership, and situated in the metropolis of the world, should be the recipient of a work containing a statement and defence of Christianity as a universal religion from the pen of its Apostle.

While recognising the legitimacy of the theory propounded by Weiss, I can hardly regard it as probable, or as justified by any supposed impossibility of giving any other account of the matter. I doubt in the first place if the question discussed in chapters ix.-xi. was so new to Paul's mind as the theory implies. I rather incline to think that all the possible issues involved in the Judaistic controversy were clear to his view from an early period, and also the answers to all possible objections to his conception of Christianity. Then, on the other hand, I think, that he would keep these answers to himself, till a need arose for communicating them to others. One fails to see why he should trouble others with his thoughts on the comparatively speculative topic of the prerogatives of Israel, if nobody was stirring the question. Why deal with a difficult problem like that, not vital to faith, before it had arisen? At the very least Paul must have regarded it as possible that the question would be raised ere long in the Church to which he sent the letter treating it. That this would happen was not only possible but probable. Assuming

¹ Weiss, *Introduction*, i. 306.

with Weiss, and the majority of recent writers on the Epistle, that the membership of the Roman Church was mainly of Gentile extraction, how natural that men connected with the Judaistic propagandism should regard with envy and chagrin a flourishing Christian community in the capital of the empire! How unwelcome to their mind these increasing signs that the stream of spiritual life was cutting out for itself a new channel, and leaving Palestine, formerly the centre of religious influence, high and dry! What more likely than that the impulse should arise in their hearts to make a last effort to recover lost power, and if possible win over to their side a church which, though Gentile, might not yet be decidedly Pauline? An attempt of this kind, however desperate, was by no means improbable. It might even have been in contemplation when Paul wrote his Epistle, and as Weizsäcker suggests, the fact coming to the Apostle's knowledge may have been what determined him to take that step as a means of frustrating by anticipation the sinister scheme.¹

If the membership of the Roman Church was mainly of *Jewish* birth, the mischief would not need to be imported. What the actual fact was in the matter of nationality has since the days of Dr. Baur been a *quæstio vexata* for theologians. Baur himself was a strenuous advocate of the Jewish hypothesis, and through his influence, reinforced by that of Mangold, it became for a time the prevailing view. But the weighty interposition of Weizsäcker in behalf of the opposite hypothesis changed the current of opinion, and now it may be said to be the generally accepted theory that the Church of Rome, at the time our Epistle was written, was predominantly Gentile. In absence of information from other sources as to the origin and composition of the Church, disputants are obliged to rely on the general impression which the Epistle makes on their minds, and on

¹ Vide *Das apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 411.

individual texts and phrases. The advocates of either hypothesis are able to explain away to their own satisfaction the passages founded on by the champions of the opposite hypothesis. Thus, "all the nations among whom are ye,"¹ seems beyond dispute to make for a Gentile constituency. But the supporter of the rival opinion contends that it suited the Apostle's purpose in the connection of thought to include the Jews among the peoples to which his commission extended. In like manner the expression, "I speak to you that are Gentiles,"² is disposed of by the remark that if the membership of the Church had been mainly Gentile, it would not have been necessary to state that he addressed himself to such. On the other hand, the pro-Jewish allusions are disposed of by patrons of the Gentile hypothesis with at least equal facility. "Abraham our father"³ finds its parallel in the phrase "our fathers" occurring in the first Epistle to the Corinthians,⁴ and "ye are become dead to the law through the body of Christ,"⁵ might be said to Gentile believers in Rome with as much propriety as that God sent His Son "to redeem them that were under the law" to Gentile Christians in Galatia.⁶ I do not mean to suggest, however, that the balance is even between the two parties. The weight of argument inclines to the Gentile side. While I say this I must acknowledge that my own mind is influenced not so much by particular texts, but rather by the general consideration that the hypothesis of a Gentile constituency best fits in to the situation required by the Epistle. In that case the Roman Church becomes the proof and symbol of that triumph of Gentile Christianity which *ex hypothesi* is the occasion of the complaint where-with the Apostle feels called on to deal.

It is important to observe that the determination of the question as to the nationality of Roman Christians is in no

¹ Rom. i. 6.² Rom. xi. 13.³ Rom. iv. 1.⁴ 1 Cor. x. 1.⁵ Rom. vii. 4.⁶ Gal. iv. 4, 5.

way necessary to the understanding of Paul's Epistle to the Roman Church. The one thing indispensable is to grasp firmly the fact that the Epistle was meant to deal with the final manifestation of Judaistic sentiment, the jealousy awakened by the progress of Gentile evangelisation. That is far more certain than either of the views as to the composition of the Church, as is shown by the fact that the advocates of both are at one as to the aim of the Epistle. Who the Roman Christians were may for ever remain doubtful; but that jealousy for the prerogative of Israel existed when Paul wrote his Epistle to the Romans may be regarded as beyond doubt, and that the Roman Church was somehow connected with it may be inferred from the simple fact of the Epistle which handles the topic being addressed to it.

Besides his chief aim in writing the Epistle, Paul might have other subordinate ends in view, and among these one arising out of his new mission plans doubtless had a place. To these plans he refers in chapter xv. 22-33. He had wound up one chapter of his mission history by the settlement of the Corinthian troubles. He was about to visit Jerusalem, carrying the gifts of the Gentile churches founded by himself to the poor saints of the holy city. That done, he will be ready and eager to break new ground, and to visit the regions of Western Europe, bearing to the nations the Gospel of peace. For this new campaign Rome will form the natural base of operations. He must make the acquaintance of the Church there, and get her good will and cordial support in his new enterprise. In view of this great missionary project, our Epistle may be regarded as a pioneer, or preparer of the way; a first step towards the execution of the contemplated operations. In the circumstances it was almost a matter of course that the Apostle should write a letter of some sort to the Church in Rome. But something more than mission-schemes is needed to account for the actual character and contents of the letter

he did write. Possibilities of misunderstanding due to sinister influences, threatening to appear or actually at work, must have been in his view.

It is not an altogether idle fancy that in composing this remarkable letter the Apostle's mind was influenced by the thought that he was writing to a church having its seat in *Rome*. His religious inspiration came from above, but it is permissible to suppose that his theological genius was stimulated by the image of the imperial city presenting itself to his susceptible imagination. The Epistle is truly imperial in style. It deals in large comprehensive categories: Jew and Gentile, Greeks and barbarians, wise and unwise. It draws within the scope of its survey the whole human race, throughout the entire range of its religious history. It breathes the spirit of a truly imperial ambition. The writer aspires to the conquest of the world, and holds himself bound to preach the gospel to all nations for the obedience of faith, that Christ may become in the spiritual sphere what Cæsar was in the political. And he is animated by a magnanimity becoming the ambassador of One whom he regards as by Divine right and destiny the universal Lord. He believes in no unconquerable enmities or final alienations. He will have all men be saved, all peoples reconciled to God and to one another. Jew and Gentile united in a common brotherhood, and living peaceably together under the benign rule of King Jesus. The leading aim of the Epistle, as we have seen, required Paul so to write, and apart altogether from the exigencies of the situation, the grand style of thinking came natural to him. But the consciousness that his letter was going to Rome made it all the easier for a man of his kingly temper. Before the majesty of the greatest city in the world meaner natures might feel abashed. But Paul was not ashamed or afraid either to preach there or to send a letter thither. He could rise to the occasion, witness this magnificent Epistle!

A. B. BRUCE.

HEBREWS VI. 4-6.

“For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good word of God and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.”

WE propose to examine the above deeply interesting and important passage of the Epistle to the Hebrews, with the view of endeavouring to ascertain whether the commonly received interpretation, by which it is understood to express the fate of apostates from the faith of Christ, is necessary; or whether it may be still more suitably applied to persons more numerous, more widespread, and more frequently met with. The passage, too, is one of those which demand attentive consideration in the light of its immediately practical results. Like the words of our Lord Himself, when He says of the sin against the Holy Ghost, that it cannot be forgiven either in this world or the world to come, the words of the Epistle have struck terror into many a heart, and have led not a few followers of Christ into despair rather than into renewed or increased exertion in the Christian life. It becomes, therefore, of the more consequence that we endeavour to understand them rightly, so that we may apply to the proper parties the solemn warning which they contain. In doing this it will not be possible to defend every interpretation of particular words or phrases which we shall adopt. Want of space forbids this, and many of these interpretations may be accepted or rejected without affecting the main line of argument. A different course must be pursued where the argument is touched.

1. We have to think of the actual condition of those to whom the verses before us were addressed. That condition is described in chapter v. 11, 12, and again in the present

chapter, verses 1 and 2 and 4-6. For it must be observed that these three groups of verses refer to one and the same class of persons. It will not do to say that the first two groups refer to some who are only beginning; the last group to others who have made great advances in the Christian life. The sacred writer does not, in order to warn and stimulate the first class, introduce the thought of a second class overtaken by complete apostasy from Christ. Had he done so, the force of his warning would have been in great measure lost. It was essential that the Christian experience described in chapter vi. 4-6 should be felt by those to whom he is writing to be a description of what either was now or had been their own state, and not of a state of others which they had never reached. That different points of progress are alluded to when, on the one hand, we read in chapter v. 12, 13 and chapter vi. 1 of "the rudiments of the beginning of the oracles of God," of "milk," of "babes," and of "the word of the beginning of Christ"; and when, on the other hand, we read in chapter vi. 4-6 of all that is involved in the clauses there heaped one upon another, cannot indeed be denied: but it is clear that both points had been, at one time or another, attained by the readers of the Epistle. The use of the word *γεγόνατε* in chapter v. 11, 12 is sufficient to prove this—not "ye are," but "ye have become." They had begun well, and for a time at least they had made progress corresponding to their beginning. At all events, whatever meaning we may attach to the successive clauses of verse 5 until we reach the end of the verse (but not including the first clause of verse 6), it is hardly possible to doubt that the state described had been that of those to whom the writer speaks. Or if, passing to the first clause of verse 6, *καὶ παραπεσόντας*, we understand it as generally understood, not as a condition into which those addressed had actually sunk, but as the condition "of those who, with a distinct

conviction of the Divine mission of Jesus, have deliberately joined His foes, unite in denouncing Him as a deceiver, rejoice in His shame, and thus 'for themselves crucify a second time the Son of God'' (Moulton, *in loc.*), may we not ask whether such a description, not applicable to themselves, could have had any powerful effect upon the readers of the words? Would they not have replied, You are dealing with others than us; we have committed no such sin? Regard either side of the description as simply supposititious, and the words of the sacred writer lose their practical application to an actually existing state of things. When, accordingly, Dr. Westcott speaks of "such men as have been *imagined*" (on ver. 6), he seems to introduce a thought foreign to the course of reasoning before us; and we must rather agree with Dr. A. B. Davidson that, "though the apostle's language is general and spoken in a historical way, it has no relevancy unless meant to be a picture of the 'Hebrews'" (*in loc.*). The supposed case is made by the latter commentator, whether rightly or wrongly we shall not now enquire, to begin with *παραπεσόντας*. Upon the point just mentioned, then, we have to make up our minds. If all that could be said of the Hebrew Christians addressed is contained in the first and second verses of the chapter; if they had as yet had no practical experience of the spiritual power described in the fourth and fifth verses, the interpretation of the passage as a whole will be materially affected. Believing, however, that, if those whose condition is delineated in verses 1, 2 had not also passed through the spiritual experiences of which mention is made in verses 4-6, the nerve of the Apostle's argument is destroyed, we are compelled to conclude that the description given in these latter verses is applicable to the persons spoken of in the first two verses of the chapter.

When, then, we note what the actual condition of these

Hebrew Christians was, we shall at once see that no indication is given us that, after having for a time believed, they had at length completely rejected Christ. They had received Him at the first as the Messiah promised to their fathers. They had welcomed His great salvation. In repentance from dead works—that is, works apart from Christ, the only source of life; in faith towards God as revealed to them in the Son; ¹ in learning to draw a broad line of distinction between the washings of the Jewish law and the great washing of Christian Baptism; between the layings on of hands with which they had been familiar, and the new laying on of hands by Apostles and divinely commissioned ministers of Christ, through which the Holy Spirit, in the manifoldness of His power was given them; in paying due heed to the teaching of the Church of which they had become members, with regard to the resurrection of the dead and eternal judgment;—in all this they had laid the foundations of the Christian life, and that, too, with earnestness and sincerity of heart. They did not need to lay such foundations a second time, even if it had been possible to do so. They had started on the Christian race, and were in a condition wholly different from that of their unbelieving countrymen who denied the claims of Christ and continued to denounce Him as an impostor and blasphemer. Nay, further, they had not only thus laid the foundation of Christian living—they had both in a large degree experienced the blessings which accompanied it, and had exhibited the higher energies from which Christ in the soul

¹ The question is often asked, Why do we read of “faith towards God?” and it is supposed that we have in the words a Theistic rather than a Christian belief—a faith in God absolutely rather than with the Christian element contained in it. That is impossible. The explanation seems to be that the writer could not use the words faith in Christ, because, with the view of Christ now in his mind, it was precisely there that the Hebrew Christians had failed. In a certain sense they did believe in Christ and in God in Him; but they had not risen to what alone constituted faith in its highest and most proper sense—faith in the exalted and heavenly Redeemer.

could not be separated. As we learn from the fourth verse of the chapter, they had been "enlightened"; had been brought into the state of those from whose hearts the natural darkness of man had been dispelled, that the light of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ might shine into them. Thus illuminated by Him who is the Light of the world, they had also tasted of the heavenly gift of a redemption which came from heaven, not from earth; which in every one of its characteristics belonged to the sphere of heaven, supplying heavenly motives, clothing the partakers of it with a heavenly character, and animating them with a heavenly hope. All that it bestowed on man was part of a higher and better world than the present, and had been freely given them of God. More still than this; they had been made partakers of Holy Spirit—of the Spirit of God in His various influences as he appealed to what they were by nature, and transformed their natural into spiritual gifts. They had tasted the good word of God, or rather had known in their own happy experience that every word spoken by Him was good, or beautiful, or noble, excellent in what it was, not less excellent in its effects. Finally, they had experienced the powers of the age to come, of that kingdom of God which had already been introduced into the world, and which was to extend itself, in righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost, both over all men and over all that all men were. The privileges enjoyed by them had been high; the graces exhibited by them had borne no small token of their heavenly origin; their life had manifested many elements of a Divine power.

But they had become "dull of hearing" (chap. v. 11). They had not advanced as they ought to have done in the knowledge and practice of the teaching of Christ's ministers. When, through the length of time that had passed since they were converted, they ought to have been able to be teachers of the truth, they had rather need that

one should teach them the very foundation-principles of their faith; they were babes in Christ instead of full-grown men. It is needless to say that, in this last description of their state, the sacred writer may in all probability follow the usual practice of one who is disappointed with the progress of those committed to him; and that, in order to rouse them more effectually, he may speak with some measure of greater sharpness than the strict circumstances of the case demanded. But, even though it be not so, though every reproof spoken is to be taken in its utmost literalness, it is obvious that we have before us something very different from a complete departure from the faith of Christ. All that has been said up to this point may probably be admitted. But it may be alleged that a new feature, and that feature now at length supposititious, not real, is introduced by the first two words of verse 6, *καὶ παραπесόντας*. We have to look at this statement, and to ask whether this verb implies the apostacy, the thought of which is generally attached to it.

The blot was certainly a dark one, and its darkness is probably enhanced by the description given of it in the one emphatic word just quoted, where the tense of the verb renders it necessary to understand it of something which had already happened. "Each part of the picture," says Westcott, "is presented to us in its past completeness" (*in loc.*). Keil also holds that it expresses, in contrast with the present participles following, that change which had once for all taken place in their state (*die einmal geschehene Wendung, in loc.*); and Delitzsch, while saying in one part of his exposition, "It was over this abyss that the Hebrew Christians were now standing," as if they had not yet fallen into the abyss, yet in another part fully allows the force of the participle: "The aorist participle expresses the fatal change that has once for all come over them" (*in loc.*). As to the meaning of the participle, therefore, there can be no dubiety.

The Hebrew Christians had not only been "enlightened," had not only experienced all that is described in the clauses immediately following that word: they had also sunk into the state described by the term *παραπεσόντας*. What then does the term imply? Is it determined and complete apostacy now judicially punished by the Almighty? Is it such a fall that "the apostates can no longer lay hold of the grace of Jesus Christ, even though they wished to do so" (Delitzsch)? The verb *παραπίπτειν* is found only here in the New Testament, though frequently met with in the LXX., and especially in the prophecies of Ezekiel, where it is joined with *παράπτωμα* (*παραπεσεῖν παράπτωμα*, xiv. 13, xv. 8, xviii. 24, xx. 27), but in a sense which shows that the wilfulness of the sin alluded to is in the prophet's mind, and not the sin viewed as the mere result of carelessness and thoughtlessness (*comp. Cremer, s.v.*), yet though in these passages the Greek is the translation of the Hebrew *לָצַד*, we have no right, with Cremer, to transfer to it the stronger sense in which that Hebrew word is used in 2 Chronicles xxvi. 18, xxix. 6, 19, etc., where the LXX. render by *ἀποστῆναι*. On the contrary, in the single passage in the prophet in which the Greek word is used by itself, the parallelism makes it clear that it rather signifies transgression in its ordinary meaning, "Thou art become guilty (*παραπέπτωκας*) in thy blood that thou hast shed, and hast defiled thyself in thine idols which thou hast made" (Ezek. xxii. 4). Allowing, therefore, that the thought of deliberateness in sinning belongs to *παραπίπτειν*, it cannot be at the same time allowed that it is always equivalent to *ἀποστῆναι* or *ἀποστασία*. Properly speaking indeed the word means falling aside or swerving from the right path; it may even be intentional turning away from truth that has been learned, entered upon, and walked by. In this respect it corresponds to *ἐκουσίως ἁμαρτάνειν* in Hebrews x. 26, but does not, taken by itself, express so strong a meaning as the other com-

pound of the simple verb in Galatians v. 4, ἐκπίπτειν. Probably the preposition παρά brings in more of the thought of personal action, while the preposition ἐκ leads us rather to the thought of state, in which case the first of these two prepositions has, of necessity, its full meaning only while the personal action is continued. Our contention therefore is that παραπεσόντας in our present passage, while describing a condition into which the Hebrew Christians had fallen, does not speak of it as absolute apostacy, as a condition of alienation from God, in which they were sealed by His just judgment, in which no change of mind could be experienced, and from which there could be no hope of return. They had forsaken the true path, they had entered on a false one, they had abandoned great principles, they had allowed inferior principles to usurp their place, they had sinfully departed from Christ as He was; but they did not wholly and consciously deny Him. Thus viewed also παραπεσόντας is not to be separated from the other aorist participles preceding, as if it meant (with the Authorised Version) "if they shall fall away." It belongs to the same persons whose progress in Christianity was set forth in the previous clauses. The Hebrew Christians reproved "were once enlightened," with all that follows, "and then fell away" (R.V.).

2. What has now been said will become clearer if we observe what it is that the sacred writer wishes those to whom he thus writes to do. Surely it cannot be thought for a moment that his only desire is to stir up in them that "remorseful anguish which comes too late and involves in it a sense of its own impotency" (Delitzsch). His whole aim is rather to urge them to advance, to make a very different progress from what they were now making, in spiritual appropriation of the truth and in practical experience of its power. At verse 10 of the previous chapter he had been suddenly stopped, when about to enter upon the leading theme of his Epistle, by the reflection that the persons to whom he

was writing would be unable to comprehend him. He had in his mind a revelation connected with what he felt to be the highest aspect of that Christianity of which he had been made a minister, but he says that it was hard to be understood, and he means by that that it was hard for him to find words in explaining it which they would be able to appreciate. He would be like a grown-up man using to children words which only grown-up men can interpret. Therefore in the first verse of the sixth chapter he calls upon them to grow, to allow themselves to be borne onward by those gracious influences of God which are ever free and open to those who will receive them, to forget the things that are behind, to press on to the things that are before, to cease to be children, to learn to be men. And this, he says, his spirits rising at the thought that they will obey him, "this will we do if God permit"; until, having recalled as he proceeds with the chapter the many tokens of faith and love which they exhibited, he, at chapter vii. does enter upon the very topic on which he fears at chapter v. 10 that he must be silent. Notwithstanding, in short, the falling away with which they were chargeable, he was "persuaded better things of them, and things that accompany salvation," although he spoke as he did (vi. 9).

Some important words in the passage still remain to be considered before we are in a position to estimate its general bearing, or to decide as to the particular class of persons who are called upon to apply it to themselves. We refer, in the first place, to the participial clause at the close of verse 6: *ἀνασταυρούντας ἑαυτοῖς τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ παραδειγματίζοντας*. The words *τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ* in this clause will fall to be considered afterwards. Meanwhile we deal only with the participles. Of the two verbs used in the clause it is unnecessary to say much. The first is a *ἀπ. λεγ.* in the New Testament, the simple verb being always elsewhere used for the act of crucifying. But this

very fact goes far to confirm the interpretation of the Greek fathers, to whom the meaning of the compound verb as employed in ordinary Greek must have been known, when they see in the preposition with which the simple verb is here compounded a fresh element of force. Nor does it appear that even those who would everywhere conform, as far as possible, to common Greek usage deny that the word may with perfect propriety be so interpreted here. (*See Cremer.*) We may, therefore, without further discussion adopt this view, and translate not simply "crucify," but "crucify afresh." The second verb is also a *ἀπ. λεγ.* in the New Testament, for in Matthew i. 19 the simple form appears to be the true reading, and it marks the fact that those of whom it is alleged were chargeable with the sin of holding up to scorn the Redeemer whom they had professed to honour, and that they thus weakened His influence over others. The most important point, however, in connection with both words is to ask, What is the bearing of the present participles? That they are intentionally used is at once made evident by the transition from the aorists in verses 4 and 5. With that long succession of past tenses in his mind the sacred writer would unquestionably have also here resorted to the same tense had he had any single act of apostacy in view. The presents are presents, and can point to nothing else than something happening at the moment. Westcott speaks of the "active continuous hostility to Christ" that is implied, and Rendall translates "keep crucifying." Without quoting further authorities this much must be allowed by all. Those who had fallen away had not merely sinned once; they are thought of as persisting in their sin. The same observation applies to the use of the present tense in Hebrews x. 26. This being the case, it is impossible to translate (as the Authorised Version, and the Revised Version in its text) "seeing they crucify to themselves," etc., *i.e.* "because they

crucify," etc. It is not denied that the present participle may have this meaning (Winer, p. 432, who compares Acts iv. 21, 1 Cor. xi. 29), but it is in the highest degree unlikely that such is the meaning here. One of two things would be implied by it, for neither of which is there any just foundation in the passage or in Scripture generally—either that, without regard to what might become the state of the guilty parties, God had decreed that such sin should be unpardonable (as Weiss, who, as we shall see, fails to catch the true force of the words "Son of God"), or that the sin of crucifying Christ was in itself unpardonable, while our Lord prayed upon the cross, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." The present participles therefore must be interpreted as implying a persistence in the sin of which they speak, and must be translated either "engaged as they are in crucifying," etc., or more tersely (with the margin of the Revised Version), "the while they crucify the Son of God, and put Him to an open shame."

WM. MILLIGAN.

(*To be concluded.*)

THE FIRST STORM.

MATT. VIII. 23. MARK IV. 35. LUKE VIII. 22.

THE mischievous notion is very commonly held, and sometimes by men who are quite unaware of entertaining it, that the ideal cannot become the actual. In common life there is a wide gulf between the two; but this is the result (and perhaps the measure) of the Fall; and our recovery should close the chasm. Therefore the heart of Virgil did not despair, any more than the inspiration of Isaiah, of a perfect world being made the environment of a restored humanity. Yet the notion that the ideal is impossible is

carried so far by modern scepticism (sceptical of much besides religion) that it seeks to refute many a lofty belief by showing that similar beliefs have often floated up out of the depths of human reverie and desire. Thus the Incarnation is thought to be discredited, when its enemies can produce legends of the miraculous birth of Alexander, of the Buddha, or of Pythagoras. It would be much more reasonable to inquire, how could such beliefs have originated, among races not the most untutored and least profound, and what soil nourished them, unless our nature found something congenial in the anticipation that the divine might come into humanity, that manhood might be far greater than men are, but that for such an advance, an adequate cause must be forthcoming. These beliefs were the product of yearning, the embodiment of the ideal, betrayed into error by "lights which do mislead the morn." But it is a strange proposition that our beliefs are shown to be incredible, by showing that human nature instinctively reaches out towards them. And we claim very little, when we assert that no quantity of such myth or legend subtracts from the credibility of the Christian belief, attached as it is, in so pure and dignified a narrative, to such a person as our Christ. The widespread existence of beliefs in a supernatural birth shows that human nature forebodes a divine man. He is the ideal. And the wonderful differences between our pure and simple story of the incarnation, and all these adumbrations of it, and also between Jesus and their heroes and sages, shows how far is He from being one more natural person to whom, for an hour or a generation, the divine hope has clung.

At the very utmost the only advantage which unbelief can obtain from such analogies is drawn from the base tendency to despair of ideals in general, as if they were unattainable, as if the best were essentially the enemy of the good.

So it is with what are called the Nature-miracles, of which the greatest are found in the quelling of the two storms. Certainly the Old Testament has either foreseen, or dreamed of a time when nature should obey man, when all things should be under his feet. And if the ideal is not incredible, if there is no inherent absurdity in the splendid hope of a day, when man, lord of himself, should also be lord of the world around him, then such prophecies are at least not less to be relied upon, because their hope is common to the literatures of India, Rome and the Norsemen.

It follows that if Jesus came to found the kingdom of God; if the gentle and unobtrusive marvels of His earthly life were His credentials to establish His claim upon the loyalty of His subjects, at the stormy beginning of the reign which should bring in eternal peace, it is most reasonable to expect among them some evidence of His mastery over the external world. On the other hand, scepticism must deny these works at all hazards, since there is no possibility of explaining them by the impressibility of the subject. If they are true, they are miracle in its purest form. We are told then that because Moses led the children of Israel through the Red Sea, it was necessary to the Christian legend that Jesus should do something similar; or else that these beliefs were suggested by the promise, "When thou passest through the waters they shall not overflow thee." People felt the want of such miracles; their faith had a sense of need, a craving for the prodigious, like that of Sir Thomas Browne, who rather sorrowed because he had not miracles enough for his power of credence. And then, recalling some hair-breadth escapes, in which the calmness of their Master had sustained them, they allowed fancy to embroider its strange devices on the simple fabric of their memories.

To all this it must be flatly answered that nothing of the kind has happened. The myths which might be engendered

by such a process are utterly different from the narratives before us. The exploit of Moses, rending asunder the sea for his followers and engulfing a hostile army, and the vivid imagery of the prophets, who sang of the drying up of rivers, the utter destruction of the tongue of the Egyptian sea, and making the depths a way for the ransomed to pass over, not from these splendours did the Christian fancy, greatly daring, evolve the smoothing of the waves around a fishing-boat. Equally futile is the contention that a necessary and inevitable process evolved a belief in the literal fulfilment of half of a certain promise, yet left the other half untouched. The words are these: "When thou passest through the waters I will be with thee; and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee; when thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee" (Isa. xliii. 2). Now why should these fanciful mythologists, so intent upon rivalling Moses (on a very small scale) have felt no emulation whatever for the Hebrew children?

The whole Spirit of the Old Testament marvels, if suggesting any miracles whatever, would have suggested miracles far different from ours. These works were directly aimed at astonishment rather than consolation; they rather thrust nature aside than healed her discords; they courted publicity, they revealed a God of vengeance, and affected the politics of great nations. And the imagination would revel in imitating such prodigies. But the Gospel knows nothing of such "nature-miracles" as these; and of this difference the cause is the difference of ethical purpose between the Old Testament and the New. The miracles of Moses were performed to show that Jehovah was God: those of our Lord to introduce the seed which should grow secretly, the kingdom which was not with observation, the leaven hid in the meal.

And they are true to their purpose. Signs and wonders

were thrust on Pharaoh, but Herod hoped in vain to see some miracle done by Jesus. Only to the few disciples in the boat was the stilling of the tempest an evidence at first-hand, and for them it was not the laying bare of the bed of the lake, but the restoration of such conditions that their usual efforts could enable them to reach the shore. The nature-miracles of Jesus are few, they are self-controlled almost to austerity, and their simple grandeur contrasts with those of the Exodus like a Doric façade with flamboyant Gothic.¹

Moreover, their ideal is exactly the ideal of the Gospel. It is the restoration of nature from its convulsions, not the awaking of its dread powers against a foe. And in this respect, the predictions of the Old Testament would have been as misleading as its examples. Isaiah said, "with His scorching wind shall He shake His hand over the River. . . . and cause men to march over dryshod" (xii. 15), but the Saviour never excited a tempest: His word is the same to nature as to souls: it is, "Peace, be still!"

Passing to the narrative itself, it is suggestive to observe

¹ "Unquestionably, there rests upon this brief and pregnant narrative a rare majesty. . . . With a few masterly strokes, there is here sketched a most sublime picture from the life of Jesus, and a picture full of truth. . . . Even His rising up against weather and sea is told by Matthew and Luke quite simply, without any ostentation; and the tentative query of the disciples, after their deliverance was accomplished, "Who is this?" is the slightest possible, the only too modest, and yet the true, utterance of the impression which they must at that time have received." (Keim, *Jesus of N.*, iv. 180.) And yet Keim goes on to reduce the whole story, the antiquity of which is "undeniable," to a *caput mortuum*. "As we examine more closely, the genuine nucleus of the narrative grows ever less and less, and the additions grow greater and greater." (p. 182.) And this is entirely due to that abuse of quotations from the Old Testament which is here, most of all, the common resort of the Sceptics, and which is examined above. It must be said that the passages from the Psalms, which Keim adduces, are as little to the point as if he explained the sleep of Jesus by the words "He giveth His beloved in sleep," coupled with the belief that Jesus was the Beloved Son. And also that the passage above quoted is by no means a solitary example of the odd fallacy which disposes of evidence by frankly stating it, and then leaving it unrefuted, but ignored in the conclusion.

the incidents which immediately precede it in St. Matthew. One man desires to follow Jesus everywhere, but he has not counted the cost, for Jesus reminds him that "the Son of man hath not where to lay His head." Another is summoned to prompt obedience: "Follow me, and leave the dead to bury their own dead." Why does the evangelist place these brief incidents just here? Was it to suggest the questions, With what feeling would that easy follower have confronted imminent death? How did the other think of such an experience in discipleship? Perhaps this context is the explanation of a phrase which has excited not a little comment; for at the end of the narrative the same evangelist does not say that the twelve marvelled, but "the men" (*οἱ δὲ ἄνθρωποι*).

Jesus, in St. Matthew, enters a boat, and His disciples follow. In the other two Gospels He expressly says, "Let us go over unto the other side"; and if, as appears presently, they felt that He had power enough to rescue them, then this invitation, this plain statement of His purpose, ought to have calmed their fears. But so great a storm arose that St. Matthew applies to it the word commonly used of an earthquake. It was a convulsion. Violent squalls are common to all lakes deeply buried among mountains, because the air which is warmed in the basin becomes rarefied and ascends, and the cold air above sinks to be warmed in turn. It is evident that with any sudden and abrupt change of temperature, within limits restricted by the mountain walls, the process would become violent and lead to tempest.¹ But the sea of Galilee is no common mountain water. Already the Jordan, in its headlong course to the marvellous depression where its waters grow

¹ But the process is so constant, that a summer shower, among the great cliffs of the Irish coast, can always be escaped by sitting on the edge of the precipice, and I have often watched the silver lance-heads of the rain lifted by the uprush of warm air in a glittering arch over my head.

stagnant over the cities of the plain, has sunk six hundred feet below the level of the Mediterranean. And the difference in level between this hollow and the plains which slope eastward from snowy Lebanon produces tempests such as that for which St. Matthew strained the language (*σεισμός*, in the others *λαίλαψ*).

In the meantime, the great Teacher had exhausted even His perfect frame. They had received Him into the boat "even as He was," which means, without the additional exertion of any preparation for the voyage, and He sank at once into peaceful slumber, His head upon the helmsman's cushion, *τό προσκεφάλαιον*, the only one on board. Thus do extremes meet; and the heavy and joyless slumber into which the guilty agitation of Jonah lapsed at last, was not more profound than the sweet and balmy repose of Christ. That repose was not lightly broken. His people, in reliance upon His declared purpose, struggled on as long as there was any natural possibility of escape. But when the waves tumbled into the ship so that the ship was already in the act of foundering, they could be still no longer. His sleep no longer seemed to express confidence in the result, but indifference what the result might be—an indifference which they could not share; and they cried to Him, Master, Master, we perish; Master, carest Thou not that we perish; save, Lord, we perish. That three various expressions should be used by a boat-full of agitated men has been a matter of grave discussion by some students—not surely of human nature; for a true cause of wonder would have arisen if they had stayed to decide upon a common form of words suitable for the occasion. And He arose and "rebuked the double storm, in their bosoms and in the sky," speaking first a brief word of reassurance to His followers, then granting deliverance to their reawakening faith, renewed by the grandeur of His bearing and by His words, and after He had hushed the storm, expostulating

more strongly with their unbelief. It is then that He quite denies to such an appeal as theirs the honourable name of faith, thus no doubt establishing, according to two evangelists, a verbal conflict with His previous admission in St. Matthew that they had some "little faith."¹ Persons whom such a "contradiction" afflicts may advantageously begin by asking how it is possible, from him that hath not, to take away that which he hath. And this same text will warn us all against just such languid reliance, such insufficient, and yet not quite unreal belief, as the disciples seem to have had. Were it not for the special and immediate presence of Jesus, their little faith, which was not faith, would have been quite "taken away" by the urgency of their peril. Now it is by nourishing our trust in Christ, through prayer and meditation, and the habitual realization of His nearness, that we shall be kept unshaken in the hour of trial, which we also must endure. This is the victory that overcometh the world, its alarms as well as its seductions, even our faith.

Too much, probably, has been made of the fact that our Lord addressed the winds and waves quite as if they were persons, with intelligence to hear and obey; and some have contended that Jesus really addressed the evil spirits who were the secret instigators of the storm. That is by no means what we read. And such a demonology is more than precarious, for it is the doctrine of both Testaments that God blows with His winds; that they are his ministers; that His angel holds the winds of heaven and lets them loose. And certainly the personification in this verse is no bolder than when Ezekiel prophesied to the four winds, or when Christ Himself said that if the children held their peace, the very stones would cry out.

¹ *ὀλιγόπιστος* is one of our Lord's own words. It occurs again in Matt. vi. 30, xiv. 31, xvi. 8, and Luke xii. 28 only.

There is something marvellous and significant in the contrast between the two moments, when Jesus, bearing all our weakness, sank into exhausted slumber, and when, responding to our appeal, He put forth energies that mastered nature. To such weakness did He condescend ; such rights did He assert and exercise.

He spoke to the waves as well as to the winds, because the billows heave long after the storm goes down ; and those sailors would well appreciate the marvel of waters suddenly quieted and glassy, reflecting skies over which the clouds no longer raced. Yet the supreme grandeur belongs not to that instant transformation, but to the moment just before ; to the mighty Presence, standing aloft upon the reeling deck, matching His voice against the roaring skies and waters, and overawing their passions with His calm.

In all this there is an abiding significance, because He has said to the Church and to its members, *Lo, I am with you always*, and because He is the same yesterday and to-day. Therefore it is no mere type ; no acted parable of the preserving care which we may trust : it is a precedent—a case in point, as often as we are storm-beaten, as often as the waves of earthly or spiritual adversity lash our frail bark and threaten to swallow it ; as often as we cry to Him, even with an inadequate and fearful appeal.

G. A. CHADWICK.

“THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.”

Ματθαῖος μὲν οἶν Ἑβραϊδὶ διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνετάξατο
Ἠρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.

ΡΑΡΙΑΣ APUD EUSEBIUM, H. E., iii. 39.

[AT the request of the Editor of THE EXPOSITOR, I prefix a few lines for the purpose of commending the following pages to students interested in the subject with which they deal. Mr. Allen writes so clearly and cogently that the philological defects of Professor Marshall's results will be evident, I am sure, even to those readers who have no special knowledge of Aramaic to guide them. I wish indeed that a different verdict upon Prof. Marshall's protracted and self-denying labours had been possible. In principle, the hypothesis that the differences frequently observable between parallel passages in the Synoptic Gospels may have arisen from one of the variants being the translation of a corrupt Hebrew or Aramaic text, is a thoroughly legitimate one; it is only because, when brought to a practical test, it is found to fail, that it has of necessity to be rejected. A theory which, as Mr. Allen shows, postulates the repeated use of Aramaic words in forced or unidiomatic applications, and with hypothetical meanings entirely unknown to Aramaic literature, cannot be a sound one. It may suffice to explain the phenomena presented by the Gospels in a few isolated and comparatively simple cases: more than this cannot be conceded. There is only one point in Mr. Allen's argument at which, perhaps, exception may be taken. It might be urged, namely, that whereas one of the divergent renderings is based (*ex hyp.*) upon a *corruption* of the original Aramaic text, the inaccurate Aramaic usage which it implies cannot be pleaded against the soundness of the hypothesis, the inaccuracy lying not in the original text, but in the corruption. This is true;

but it may be noticed that not unfrequently both the assumed original reading and the corruption are equally questionable as Aramaic: it is, moreover, a serious defect in Prof. Marshall's method, that often, not to say usually, he leaves this point in ambiguity, and does not, on each occasion, tell his reader distinctly which of the alternatives proposed he conceives to be the genuine original reading, and which the corruption. Without the smallest prepossession against Prof. Marshall's hypothesis, and with every desire to judge it favourably, it is impossible, upon grounds of pure philology, to admit that it possesses plausibility in more than a very small proportion of the instances to which its author has applied it.—S. R. DRIVER.]

Among the unsolved problems which still exercise the ingenuity of New Testament critics, some of the most difficult and baffling are those connected with the so-called Logia of St. Matthew. In what language were they written? What did they contain? Did our three synoptists use them in compiling their Gospels? If so, can we reconstruct them? With regard to the second and third of these questions, critical inquiry has not, we are told, been altogether barren. "It used," writes Dr. Sanday,¹ "to be keenly debated, whether the Logia admitted any element of narrative; now this is practically not denied." And the same authority assures us² that there is a very large consensus of scholars in favour of what is called the Two-Document Hypothesis; "namely, that at the root of our three Synoptics there lie two main documents—a narrative by St. Mark," and the Logia of St. Matthew. With regard, however, to the fourth point, controversy still rages. It is hotly debated, we are told, where we are to begin in our search. Shall we find the missing fragments of the Logia in

¹ EXPOSITOR, April, 1891, p. 305.

² EXPOSITOR, April, 1891, p. 302; Feb., 1891, p. 91.

greater proportion in St. Matthew or in St. Luke? And no two critics are agreed upon the method of rediscovery to be pursued. Under such circumstances every fresh suggestion that seems to point to final success, comes as a ray of light to men groping in darkness. And quite recently a new attempt has been made, an attempt so striking in conception, and so elaborately developed in detail, that it seems to demand a close and minute examination.

In a series of articles which appeared in the EXPOSITOR at various times between January, 1891, and August, 1892, Prof. Marshall attempts to prove the possibility, not only of detecting the Logia fragments that lie embedded in our Gospels, but also of retranslating them into the original Aramaic. Antecedently such a theory is an attractive one, and we may say once for all that we do not approach it with any prepossessions against it. As readers of the EXPOSITOR will be aware, it is sometimes possible from the divergent readings of the Syriac and Greek translations of Ecclesiasticus, to restore with absolute certainty the original text. A case in point may be found in Ecclus. iv. 15.¹ Here the Greek translator renders "he who will give ear to her [wisdom] shall judge nations (ἡ ἀλήθεια)," whilst the Syriac, no doubt rightly, gives "shall judge truth (ܐܠܗܘܬܐ)." A wrong punctuation on the part of the Greek translator gave rise to a complete misunderstanding of the text. Theoretically, then, Prof. Marshall's method would seem plausible, but as it is elaborated by him, it distinctly and emphatically fails to account for the phenomena to be explained. In order to embrace the variations in the Greek text of the Gospels within the limits of a single Aramaic word or phrase, he is obliged to coin for words meanings which they never possessed, and to create new constructions which defy grammatical analysis. He has no feeling

¹ *Speaker's Comm.*, Introd. to Ecclus., p. 27.

for Aramaic usage or Aramaic idiom. In almost every case where his retranslations have a seeming plausibility, it will be found upon examination that they are linguistically impossible. In the following pages we propose to justify what has just been said, by the few illustrations which our space permits us, and then to offer some further considerations of the theory from a more general point of view.

In the March number of the EXPOSITOR¹ Prof. Marshall proceeds to give instances of "portions of the Synoptic Gospels which present indications of having been translated from an Aramaic original." The second of these deals with a verse in the Parable of the Sower (St. Matt. xiii. 4, St. Luke viii. 5, St. Mark iv. 4). St. Matthew and St. Mark tell us that, in the case of the seed which fell by the wayside, the birds "came" (ἦλθε) and devoured it. St. Luke, on the other hand, says that it was "trodden down" (κατεπατήθη). Prof. Marshall supposes this latter verb to be a translation of the Aramaic root ܕܪܕ. To account for the variant ἦλθε in the other two evangelists, he assumes that ܕܪܕ also possessed the meaning of "coming in, entering," an assumption which he supports by the fact that Buxtorf gives as secondary meanings of the root "ingredi, incedere," and by the citation of two passages from the Targums (Deut. xi. 24, Prov. vi. 11). The imposition of this meaning upon ܕܪܕ is the rock upon which the whole suggestion is shipwrecked. The root-idea of the verb is "to tread," as in the passage in Deuteronomy: "Every place upon which the sole of your foot shall tread." If Buxtorf adds as secondary meanings "ingredi," "incedere," we must not assume that the word can be used to denote "walking" absolutely, much less mere "coming." Prov. vi. 11 is rightly translated by Levy, "*und über dich*

² The following criticisms, in so far as they concern the March number, are in part based upon some notes written in April, 1891, with the help of Mr. C. F. Burney, B.A., St. John's College, Oxford.

hereinbreehen." In any case the usage here is metaphorical and poetical. We may with confidence affirm that ܕܕܕ never denotes the abstract idea of motion implied in our English "coming," and every student of Aramaic must feel that the genius of the language would prohibit the application of the word to the movements of birds. Lastly, is it likely that the unusual word ܕܕܕ would have been rendered by the common-place ἡλθε?

Prof. Marshall proceeds to account for the difference between *ικμάδα* (St. Luke viii. 6) and *ρίζαν* (St. Matt. xiii. 6, St. Mark iv. 6) by supposing a confusion between *שרש* and *שרף*, to which he assigns the meaning "moisture." The facts about the word are these. The only instances of its occurrence in the Targums given in the lexicons are Genesis xxxvii. 25, xlili. 10, J.I.,¹ where the Hebrew equivalent is *צָרָה*, "balsam." Thus we have no known occurrence of the word in the sense "moisture" in Biblical Aramaic. Buxtorf and Levy cite instances from the Talmud, where the word means "succus, lachryma, humor herbarum." Even these however afford no support to Prof. Marshall. The context in St. Luke (*ἐπὶ τῆν πέτραν*) implies that the lack of moisture was a defect in the soil, upon which the seed had fallen (cf. *ικμάς* in Hdt. IV. 185). We want some word implying moisture in general, and suggesting that the plants failed to find a damp soil, from which they could draw sufficient moisture for more than a premature and short growth. Now this is just what *שרף* does not express. It always (so far as appears) denotes the juices of the plant itself. To say that a tree withers because it has no sap is mere tautology. How, without the "succus herbarum" implied in *שרף*, could the plants have attained even sufficient growth to permit of its being said that they withered?

¹ J.I. stands for the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan on the Pentateuch: J.II. for the Jerusalem Targum Fragments.

The third example is concerned with two phrases, which, rent from their context to give support to Prof. Marshall's theory, illustrate forcibly the defects of his method. The parallels in question are:—

St. Mark iv. 19: *αἱ περὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ἐπιθυμίαι.*

St. Luke viii. 14: *ἡδοναὶ τοῦ βίου.*

After postulating for *βίος* the unnecessary and doubtful meaning "fast life," Prof. Marshall gives us the following reconstruction of what he conceives to have been the original Aramaic of these phrases:—

The pleasures of luxury = רגגתא דמותר.

The desires for other things = רגגניא דכותר.

It may be affirmed with confidence that neither phrase can have the meaning assigned to it. Prof. Marshall asserts that "if כותר occurred in an Aramaic text, there would be a reasonable doubt whether it should be rendered 'other things,' or 'luxury.'" The truth rather is that there would be no reasonable doubt that neither rendering would fairly represent the original. The word denotes strictly "that which remains over," in which sense it is used in Exod. xvi. 23 (Onq.) וית כל מותרא אצנעו. Here the addition of כל, and the surrounding context, seem to suggest that "τὸ λοιπὸν" would be a fair rendering. But it must be observed that the Hebrew original is שארית, but the unusual word ערף. The more usual Aramaic word for "the rest" is שאר as in Hebrew. But granting the possibility of the first rendering, surely it is impossible to see in כותר any such connotation as "luxury." The instances quoted by Buxtorf lend no support to any meaning except "abundance," or "advantage." Thus in Isaiah i. 9, מותר טוביה, ריי means "the abundance of Jehovah's goodness," in Eccles. vi. 8, מה מותרא אית להכימא suggests the rendering "what advantage has the wise man over the fool?" and in

Eccles. ii. 13 the meaning is the same. But to identify these ideas with "luxury" or "*βίος*" is most arbitrary.

The fourth illustration presents us with the following phrases:—

St. Luke ix. 39: *καὶ μόγις ἀποχωρεῖ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ, συντριβὸν αὐτόν.*

St. Mark ix. 18: *καὶ τρίξει τοὺς ὀδόντας, καὶ ξηραίνεται.*

Prof. Marshall's renderings are:—

St. Luke: *ובענין ערק פריד.*

St. Mark: *ובשנין חרק פריד.*

Of these six words, three are used in a forced or doubtful meaning. Can *בענין* have the sense implied in *μόγις*? Does *פריד* ever mean "to wither"? And lastly, can *ערק* express the simple idea of departure implied in *ἀποχωρεῖ*?

ענין in Rabbinic Hebrew denotes, amongst other meanings, a man's business, his daily occupation. In the Targums, where however it is very rare, it signifies the material or substance of anything, or more generally "matter, affair, concern." Three instances of its use are:—

Ps. xli. 2: *טובוי למואן דמשכיל לענייני מסכנא.*

"Happy is he who attends to the concerns of the poor."

Ps. xix. 5: *מתח ענינהון* (= Heb. *קנים*).

"The spreading out of their substance."

It is altogether illegitimate to argue that, because *ענין* occurs in Rabbinic literature in the sense "molestia, occupatio, negotium," *בענין* would be used in ordinary Aramaic with the adverbial and secondary meaning expressed by *μόγις*.

But we pass on to consider the meaning of the verb *פרך*. Does it signify "to wither"? In assigning to it this sense Prof. Marshall apparently follows Levy, who renders it by (1) *etwas dörren, rösten* (Gr. *φρύγω*, Lat.

frigo), (2) *zerbröckeln*. Had Prof. Marshall consulted Fleischer's Appendix at the end of the volume, he would have seen that the first of these two renderings can no longer be maintained. Prof. Fleischer there states that כָּרַךְ is equivalent not to *φρύγειν* but to *θρύπτειν*, and that the idea of "being broken" is the proper signification of the word. This sense is supported by the renderings given in Buxtorf, and suits all the passages where the word occurs. Instances of its use are:—

Ps. lxxx. 17 : מתוקדא בנורא ומיפרכא.

"It is burned in the fire and broken down."

Eccles. iii. 3 : לפרכא בנינא = Heb. לְפָרוֹץ.

"To break down a building."

Isa. xxiv. 7 : אתפריכו גופניא.

"Fractæ, excisæ sunt vites."—*Buxt.*

The translation "to wither" is based on an unsound etymology and must be abandoned.

But lastly, we have to consider whether ערק expresses the meaning of *ἀποχωρεῖν*. It is generally used as the equivalent of the Hebrew בָּרַח or נוּס in the sense of flight, impelled by fear or terror. In the Peshitto ܥܪܩ is used to translate such words as *φυγεῖν*, *ἐκφυγεῖν*, *ἀποδιδράσκειν*. In St. Matthew ii. 13, 14 it represents *ἀναχωρεῖν*, to which the context gives the idea of flight. There is absolutely no authority for the use of the word in the simple sense of departure, and so far from any notion of "flight" being involved in *ἀποχωρεῖν*, such a nuance is distinctly excluded by the context.

The next illustration is concerned with the words in St. Matthew v. 48, "Be ye perfect" (τέλειοι), for which St. Luke (vi. 36) has "Be ye compassionate" (οἰκτίρμονες). To account for these variants it is suggested "that the one word used by our Lord was some form of חסיל;... חָסִיל, perfected, completed, is the equivalent of τέλειος, and חָסִיל may well

be rendered by *οἰκτίρων*." With regard to these very extraordinary suggestions, we can only say that both the meanings thus imposed upon *לסל* are purely hypothetical, and unwarranted. *לסל*, it is true, starts from the meaning "to be complete," but it never passes into the moral sphere. It denotes (i.) "to come to an end" (of money), "to cease" (from doing something); (ii.) "to complete" (2 Chr. vii. 11), "to consume"¹ (of locusts). With the idea of bringing to perfection it is used only of a tree ripening its fruit (Num. xvii. 23, J.II.), or in the technical sense of a nurse weaning a child (1 Sam. i. 24), an application entirely unconnected with the moral sense of *τέλειοι*. The usage of the language is a fatal objection to the proposal to impose upon *לסל* the meaning of "perfect," "upright." The connection between *οἰκτίρων* and *לסל* is, if possible, still less obvious. The latter word can only mean either "ceasing" or "weaning." It is quite incredible that it should have suggested to a Greek translator the idea involved in *οἰκτίρων*.

The seventh example presents us with the parallels:—

ST. MARK. v. 16.
 καὶ διηγήσαντο αὐτοῖς
 οἱ ἰδόντες
 πῶς ἐγένετο τῷ δαμονιζομένῳ
 καὶ περὶ τῶν χοίρων
 καὶ ἤρξαντο
 παρακαλεῖν αὐτὸν
 ἀπελθεῖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὀρίων αὐτῶν

ST. LUKE viii. 36.
 ἀπήγγειλαν δὲ αὐτοῖς
 οἱ ἰδόντες
 πῶς ἐσώθη ὁ δαμονισθεὶς
 καὶ τὸ τῆς περιχώρου
 ἅπαν πληθὸς
 ἠρώτησαν αὐτὸν
 ἀπελθεῖν ἀπ' αὐτῶν

The obvious Aramaic equivalent for *χοίρων* is *חורין*. This, if the "matres lectionis" were omitted, might be mistaken for *חורין*, and we are told that the latter word means "neighbourhood," thus accounting for *περιχώρου*. But as a matter of fact *חורין* never has this meaning.

¹ Very rare, and perhaps only a Hebraism. Levy only quotes Deut. xxviii. 38 (where it corresponds to the Heb. *לסל*); Nah. iii. 16 (in some texts).

There is an adverb חזור which is nearly always doubled, like the Hebrew סביב סביב, and which is used only in the Jerusalem Targums, the Babylonian dialect preferring סחור סחור. There is also a noun חורנותא or חורנותא (also belonging to the Palestinian dialect) which has the meaning "neighbourhood," but if we adopt this the superficial resemblance to חזירא in great part vanishes.

Another divergence to be accounted for is afforded by the couplet *πλήθος, ἤρξαντο*. The latter would be represented in Aramaic by שְׂרִיאֵי. The former, we are informed, would be שִׁירָא, a caravan; "which meaning would suit well the company of swineherds referred to."

These words give a wrong impression. The word *πλήθος* may include, but certainly has not a primary reference to, the swineherds. It is defined as ἅπαν τὸ πλήθος τῆς περιχώρου τῶν Γερασηνῶν (v. 37), and includes, we presume, those people whom the swineherds had fetched from the city and from the fields (v. 34). And secondly שִׁירָא is a rare word, and is used only of Bedouin wanderers, as in Genesis xxxvii. 25 (Onq.) שִׁירַת עֲרַבָּאֵי, or in Isaiah xxi. 13, שִׁירַת בְּנֵי דָדָן. Even in Isaiah lx. 6, where it represents שפעת, it has the same meaning; for the Targum paraphrases "company of camels" by שִׁירַת עֲרַבָּאֵי "caravan of Arabians."

In his eighth example Prof. Marshall almost outdoes himself in laxity of statement. He is comparing the sentences—

St. Matthew ix. 2: ἐπὶ κλίνης βεβλημένον,

St. Mark ii. 3: αἰρόμενον ὑπὸ τεσσάρων,

and in order that we may have a word closely resembling אַרְבַּעָה, four, he gravely informs us that "one of the synonyms for 'bed' is אַרְבַּעָה, strictly, that on which one stretches oneself." After such an assurance it is difficult to hold to our belief that אַרְבַּעָה implies not "that upon which one stretches oneself," but "the act of lying down," in

which sense it is used only of *cattle*! And yet the latter is the true meaning of the word, which apparently occurs only twice in the Targums, Isaiah vii. 25, and lxxv. 10, *בית ארבעת בקרן דתורין*, "a place of lying down of herds of oxen."

Having thus disposed of *ἐπὶ κλίνης* and *τεσσάρων*, there remain *αἰρόμενον*, and *βεβλημένον*, to be reconciled. How can we account for these? Prof. Marshall informs us that both might be represented by "the passive participle *כַּטְלַלְתָּ*," which "might mean either 'being thrown down,' or 'being carried to and fro.'" This statement is not true to fact. *כַּטְלַל* does not mean "being thrown down," nor must the Rabbinic use of the Hophal (which is not intensive), be brought forward to support such a rendering. The reduplicated form would seem to exclude the idea of lifelessness involved in *βεβλημένον*. Prof. Marshall acknowledges that the Targums prefer the passive of *רָמָה*, but adds "which is the equivalent of *טוּל*." This latter assertion is not justified. The two words express radically different shades of meaning, as a glance at Levy's or Buxtorf's examples will prove.

Once again, *כַּטְלַל* is not the equivalent of *αἰρομένον*. The word (in the active voice) is used of trees rustling their leaves (Deut. xxviii. 15, J.I.), of men shaking their heads (Job xvi. 4). It occurs frequently in the sense of "expelling," and the passive participle is used of a "wanderer," or "homeless vagrant." Even granting for the moment that Prof. Marshall is right when he asserts, without further proof, that "the Ithpael would mean 'to be carried to and fro, up and down,'" surely the context demands a word in which the idea of "to and fro, up and down" falls into the background, and that of "carrying" is predominant. The true meaning of the Ithpael may be seen in such a passage as Psalm lxxviii. 13, *אִיטְלַלּוּ כֵן פְּלִטְרִיהוֹן*, "They were driven away from their palaces." Since there are several

common words in Aramaic which express the simple notion of "carrying," e.g. סבל, טען, יבל, נטל, there can be no good reason for forcing this meaning upon the derivative טלטל. Lastly, there remains the equation ἐπί = ὑπό. "It is probable," we are informed, "that they represent נב, which means (1) upon, (2) with, near, beside." This is untrue. נב means not "upon," but "towards," after a verb of motion. In this sense it is rare. Levy cites only Numbers xxi. 9 (J.II.),

תלי אפוי בצלו נב אבוי דבשמיא

"He lifted up his face in prayer towards his Father in heaven." Here the idea of "up" lies in תלי, not in נב. More generally the word means "beside" = the Hebrew עם, or את. It does not correspond to ὑπό, and therefore "carried by four men" could not be represented by מטלטל נב ארבעה. We doubt whether these three words have any intelligible meaning at all.

The next illustration is taken from the same narrative. The parallels are—

ST. MARK ii. 4.
ἀπεστέγασαν τὴν στέγην
ὅπου ἦν
καὶ ἐξορίζαντες
χαλῶσι τὸν κράββατον

ST. LUKE v. 19.
ἀναβάντες ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα
διὰ
τῶν κεράμων
καθῆκαν αὐτὸν σὺν τῷ κλιιδίῳ

It is suggested that the variation between ἀπεστέγασαν and ἀναβάντες may be accounted for by a confusion between סליק and סליק. But it is doubtful whether סליק could have the required sense. It means strictly "to cause to ascend," and seems never to degenerate into the general idea of "lifting up." Moreover it is not generally used of concrete, physical objects, like a roof. A few examples will illustrate this.

Job. xii. 20 : וטעים סביא יסליק

Heb. : וְטַעַם יִקְנִים יִקַּח

Ps. li. 11 : סליק אפייד כון חובי

Heb. : הִסְתֵּר פָּנָיִךְ מִחַטָּאֵי

The word is used several times of the removal from Israel of the Shekinah, *e.g.* in

Deut. xxxi. 18 (Onq.) : ואנא סלקא איסליק שכנתי כנהון.

Surely this is hardly the word that would have been used to express the removal of a roof.

We have next to account for the variants *στέγη* and *δῶμα*. It is suggested that *στέγη* represents טַלְלָא, whilst *δῶμα* presupposes כְּמַטְלָא. But we are not satisfied that כְּמַטְלָא could have been applied to a house in Capernaum; and, even if so used, it would hardly have suggested to a Greek translator the word *δῶμα* as an equivalent. It is used in the Targums of the booth which Jonah erected outside Nineveh, of the sheds made by Jacob for his cattle (Gen. xxxiii. 17), of the lair of wild beasts (Ps. x. 9), and of the booths set up during the feast of Tabernacles (Lev. xxiii. 42). Lastly, in Isaiah i. 8, it represents the Hebrew כֶּסֶפֶה בְּכָרֶם. Prof. Marshall renders this "as a cottage." The usage of the word elsewhere would suggest rather the meaning "as a booth" (so Canon Cheyne). That *στέγη* could correspond to טַלְלָא is hardly more probable. The point here is that whilst the context demands for *στέγη* the concrete meaning "roof," *i.e.* the covering of a house, the word טַלְלָא, in so far as it admits of this translation at all, rather corresponds to the secondary sense which "roof" may have in English, *i.e.* "a covering, shelter, abode." The primary idea of the word is "shade, shadow," as in Ecclesiastes vi. 12, viii. 13. But since shade connotes "protection," we find the word employed in such instances as

Gen. xix. 8 (Onq.) : בטלל שריתי, "under the shadow of my dwelling";

Isa. xxx. 2 : בטלל מצרים, "in the protection of Egypt," in both of which passages the Heb. is צֶל "shadow." It will be seen from these examples that the ideas denoted by טַלְלָא and St. Mark's *στέγη* are radically different.

Lastly, there remain the variants *ἐξορῦξαντες, κεράμων*. The former suggests *הפרין*. If we transpose two letters, we get *פּחרין*. This, Prof. Marshall tells us, would mean "tiles." But we can find no example of its use in such a sense. There is an Aramaic word, *פּחרא*, which means a "potsherd, sherd, clay vessel." It represents the Hebrew *חָרָשׁ* in Isaiah xxx. 14, xlv. 9; Job ii. 8, and *כָּלִי* in Psalm xxxi. 13. But further proof is desiderated before it can be assumed that it would be applied to the tiles of a roof. The *διὰ* before *κεράμων* is equated with *ὅπου ἦν* by Prof. Marshall, who suggests that the Aramaic *בְּנוּ* may be the common original, since *בּנו* "means 'in the midst,' and thus may very well have stood as the original of *ὅπου ἦν*." But *בּנו*, "in the midst," could not have the meaning of *διὰ*. "Through," in such a context, would rather be represented by *מְן*, as in Genesis xxvi. 8 (Onq.) *ואיסתכי אבימלך...מְן חרכא* for the Hebrew *בְּעַד הַחֶלֶן...וישקף*. And so the Peshitto in St. Luke gives *ܡܢ ܕܢܘܢܐܢܐ*. And that *בּנו* standing by itself would suggest *ὅπου ἦν* is equally unlikely.

In a future number of THE EXPOSITOR we have to consider the following passages:—

ST. MATT. x. 28.
φοβείσθε δὲ μᾶλλον
τὸν δυνάμενον
καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα
ἀπολέσαι
ἐν γέεννῃ

ST. LUKE xii. 5.
φοβηθήτε
τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτείνειν
ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν
ἐμβαλεῖν
εἰς τὴν γέενναν

It is suggested that the variants *ἀπολέσαι* and *ἐμβαλεῖν* may be accounted for by a common original, *שׁנר*. The instances of this word adduced by Prof. Marshall seem sufficient to prove that it could well represent *ἐμβαλεῖν*, but we find it hard to believe that *שׁנר*, "to set on fire," would have been used in such a context. Prof. Marshall acknowledges that it seems to occur only once in the Tar-

gums, in Ezekiel xxxix. 9, where it is used of the destruction by fire of weapons of war, and adds that in Rabbinic writers it is regularly used of heating a furnace. This being so, we should have thought that the right conclusion to draw would be that the word was unworthy of a place in the Aramaic Gospel. The argument against it is threefold: (1) It is a rare word in Aramaic. (2) It could hardly have been applied to *ψυχή*. (3) It would not have been represented by so general a word as *ἀπολέσαι*. We may remark in passing that we could have wished that Prof. Marshall had given us some solution of the variants—

*καὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα, and
μετὰ τὸ ἀποκτεῖναι.*

Surely these call for explanation more urgently than the not very dissimilar *ἀπολέσαι ἐν* and *ἐμβαλεῖν εἰς*.

A further illustration in this article is taken from the Sermon on the Mount.

ST. MATT. v. 42.

*τῷ αἰτοῦντί σε
δίδον
καὶ τὸν θέλοντα
ἀπὸ σοῦ δανείσασθαι
μὴ ἀποστραφῆς*

ST. LUKE vi. 20.

*παντὶ αἰτοῦντί σε
δίδον
καὶ
ἀπὸ τῶν αἵροντος τὰ σὰ
μὴ ἀπαίτει*

τὸν θέλοντα in the first passage is dismissed by Prof. Marshall as being an “insignificant detail.” These are bold words to apply to a phrase contained in a canonical writing. And moreover a very serious difficulty is thereby concealed. It is just such additions to the supposed original document which, as we hope to show, afford a cumulative argument of great force against the entire theory.

WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.

(To be concluded.)

PROFESSOR RAMSAY'S "CHURCH IN THE
ROMAN EMPIRE." ¹

THE writings of Prof. Ramsay have been the prominent and distinguishing feature in the contributions to early Church History of the last five or six years. They stand almost in a group to themselves. There is nothing quite like them either in English or German. In some way they may be said to continue a line of research which in this country is especially connected with the name of Bishop Lightfoot. And the nearest parallel to Part II. of the present book is the excellent monograph of K. J. Neumann, *Der Römische Staat und die allgemeine Kirche* (Leipzig, 1890). But every line that Prof. Ramsay has written bears an impress of its own, which marks it off even from work which covers similar ground. This is no doubt due largely to his strong individuality, but it is also due to the peculiar circumstances under which he approaches his subject.

He starts with the best classical and historical training of an university which has of late been developing its strength chiefly in the combination of classics with history. And it may be said in passing that if apology were needed for the direction of this development, Prof. Ramsay supplies it in ample measure. Nothing could be more admirable or more strictly scientific than the method he has pursued.

With this outfit he went out to Asia Minor. He spent

¹ *The Church in the Roman Empire before A.D. 170.* By W. M. Ramsay, M.A., etc. London: Hodder and Stoughton.

several seasons in investigating the antiquities upon the spot. The fruits of his labours may be seen in the *Journal of the Hellenic Society*, and in his volume on the *Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, which was noticed in a former number of THE EXPOSITOR.¹

In the course of his inquiries he found himself thrown back upon Christian documents. He became aware what an important part Christianity had played in the region of his explorations just at the time when that region enjoyed its greatest prosperity. He was in this way led to examine those documents in the light of his knowledge previously acquired. He soon found the interest of the subject; and he was also not long in finding that the special information and assistance which he was in a position to give them were highly valued by the more professed students of ecclesiastical history and theology. The volume now published is a collection of essays and lectures which bear directly upon the early history of Christianity in its contact with the Roman empire, and especially with that part of it which has to do with Asia Minor.

The book is divided into two parts, the first of which deals with the journeys of St. Paul of which Asia Minor was the scene, while the second follows the fortunes of the infant Church, again chiefly in connexion with Asia Minor, to the middle of the reign of Marcus Aurelius. The volume concludes with two essays (one already familiar to readers of THE EXPOSITOR) on two outlying incidents, the story of Glycerius the Deacon, as gathered from the letters of St. Basil (A.D. 371-374), and another which throws light on the history of the Church of Khonai, the mediæval successor of Colossæ. Both these are skilfully and instructively handled.

But the book presents such an embarrassment of riches that in dealing with it I must perforce make a selection;

¹ 1891, i. p. 232 ff.

and I propose therefore to confine myself to three points, which are not more original than the rest—for the whole volume is full of freshness and originality—but which perhaps have the most important and novel bearing upon Christian history and literature. These points are, (1) the identification of the Galatian Churches with those founded on St. Paul's first missionary journey; (2) the course taken by the persecution of Christians in the first century; (3) the account which Prof. Ramsay gives of early Christian organization.

(1) Prof. Ramsay will, I think, command assent for all his close topographical treatment of the first journey of St. Paul as described in Acts xiii., xiv. So far as could be done by the study of books only, a good account is given of this journey in the English Lives of St. Paul. A merited tribute is paid in particular to the excellence of this part of the narrative of Conybeare and Howson. But Prof. Ramsay has the advantage of having been over the ground; and he is gifted, as few are gifted, with the power of connecting topography with history by close scientific reasoning. He has probably traced, as well as it is ever likely to be traced, the course followed by the Apostle and the localities which he visited.

But he steps on to more controverted ground when he propounds, with all the boldness and decision which characterize him, the view that the Churches founded on this journey, Antioch in Pisidia, Iconium, Lystra and Derbe, are none other than the Churches addressed in the Epistle to the Galatians. The view is of course not a new one. It has had one conspicuous advocate in recent times, M. Renan. But it had been discussed, and most of us thought sufficiently if not quite conclusively answered, by Bishop Lightfoot. It must, however, be confessed that even the great Bishop did not go into the question with so much thoroughness and precision as Prof. Ramsay. The first

point was the proof that these Churches were really included in the Roman province of Galatia. This had been recently questioned by Prof. Schürer, but is not likely to be questioned again. The next point was the proof that the Christians of this part of the province would be naturally addressed as "Galatians." I confess that I had been in the habit of thinking myself that the official designation was here out of place and would sound stilted. But Prof. Ramsay has shown that it would not be stilted but only courteous. His unrivalled knowledge of the history of the Roman political divisions, and of the attitude of the inhabitants towards those divisions, stands him in good stead. The third point is an exact analysis of the expression to which I suspect that most of us had attached a rather vague idea—"the Phrygian and Galatian country" in Acts xvi. 6. Lastly, it is, I think we must say, demonstrated that nothing could have taken St. Paul into *North* Galatia, that the roads which passed through that district led nowhere, at least to no place which St. Paul is at all likely to have visited.

There remain only two substantial arguments on the other side, (i.) that a different nomenclature is adopted in Acts ii. 9, which follows popular and not official usage (contrast 1 Pet. i. 1); and (ii.) that if St. Paul visited the Churches of South Galatia on his way to Ephesus on his third journey, he would naturally pass through Colossæ, a Church which according to Colossians ii. 1 he had never seen.

But (i.) it is not only possible but probable that Acts ii. 9 is derived from a wholly different document, the language of which has been preserved. And (ii.) although the main road from the Pisidian Antioch to Ephesus no doubt did pass through Colossæ, there was another route, branching off near Metropolis in Southern Phrygia, which for reasons unknown to us St. Paul might have taken.

On the whole it seems to me that Prof. Ramsay has made out a strong case, in which, so far as I am justified in forming an opinion, I am disposed to agree with him. The result would be a decided simplification of the history as derived conjointly from the Acts and the Epistles. We should thus know something of the antecedents of the Galatian Churches, which on the other view were almost entirely dark to us. And the important Churches of Antioch, Iconium, Lystra, and Derbe, on or near one of the great thoroughfares, would not be brought upon the stage only to be withdrawn from it again. The narrative of the Acts assumes on this hypothesis a degree of consistency and accuracy which could not otherwise be claimed for it. Another result would be that the date of the Epistle to the Galatians might be placed earlier in the scheme of St. Paul's epistles if it were desired to do so. The Epistle implies at least two previous visits, which might have been on the first and second journeys, and not on the second and third. The resemblance between Galatians and Romans is of course an argument for bringing the two Epistles near together. But this is not decisive, because Philippians also shows a marked resemblance to Romans, where the interval cannot well be less than three years. I mention this point because there are some indications that the question of the date of the Epistle to the Galatians may be raised again before long.

I have not space to do more than note the fact that Prof. Ramsay has paid special attention to the text of *Codex Bezae* in the middle chapters of the Acts. He shows that the author of some of its most characteristic readings had a special acquaintance with Asia Minor, and that he worked between the years 138-161 A.D. This is probable in itself, and I think is well made out.

There is also a little passage of arms between Prof. Ramsay and Canon Hicks in regard to the origin of the

tumult at Ephesus, with which readers of THE EXPOSITOR are familiar.¹ While fully acknowledging the interest and acuteness of Canon Hicks' suggestion, which no one but he could have made, I yet incline to give my vote against him.

(2) New and important light is thrown on the persecution of Christians in the first century. Here our author starts from a searching examination of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan in reference to the treatment of the Bithynian Christians in 112 A.D. The principal and certain inference from this is that the punishment of Christians was not a new thing, but that it was already a settled principle of the imperial policy; further, that Christians were treated simply as outlaws, and that they were liable to be punished "for the Name," *i.e.* for the mere fact of being Christians, apart from any definite crime which might be charged against them. The great problem in the early history is, When did this policy begin? And in particular, When did the name alone begin to be treated as criminal?

The first question Prof. Ramsay naturally answers by pointing to the great outbreak of persecution under Nero 64 A.D. But the second question is really the more critical. And here Prof. Ramsay believes that the special state of things which is found existing under Trajan did not begin with Nero but under the Flavian dynasty which followed; that it was initiated by Vespasian after some years of his reign had elapsed and developed by Titus and Domitian, especially by the latter, and that it assumed the dimensions of a regular persecution under that emperor.

It is allowed that from the time of Nero's first action onwards persecution never wholly ceased. The persecution of Nero, begun for the sake of diverting popular attention, was continued as a permanent police measure under the

¹ See EXPOSITOR, 1890, i. p. 401 ff.; ii. p. 1 ff., 144 ff.

form of a general prosecution of Christians as a sect dangerous to the public safety (p. 241). The difference is that whereas under Nero Christians were punished for definite alleged crimes, under the Flavii they were proscribed more systematically; not only were they punished for the mere fact of being Christians, but they were "sought out"; the police had standing instructions to make search for them. This continued the whole time from Nero onwards. There would be degrees of severity and activity in the persecution of Christians just as there would be in the pursuit of brigands. Some governors were indolent; others were merciful and were proud of bringing back the axes of their lictors with no stains of blood upon them. But the first distinct and deliberate mitigation of the severity of the law was when Trajan's rescript ordered that efforts were no longer to be made "to seek out" the Christians. The penalty of death remained against those who were clearly proved to be Christians; but so long as they were quiet and attention was not called to them, they might be let alone. This policy prevailed under Hadrian and the Antonines; indeed it was still more strongly emphasized by Hadrian, who discouraged accusations, and, if the accusation failed, turned the penalties against the accuser.

Nothing could be more admirable than the exact and closely reasoned way in which all this is worked out by Prof. Ramsay. There is however one point—and that in some respects the crucial point of all—on which I am not yet fully convinced; and on this it will perhaps be well for me to state my objections. If the policy of punishing Christians for the Name alone did not begin under the Flavii, the alternative is that it began in the later years of Nero himself. And I confess that, to me, on the evidence before me, this appears the more probable. It agrees better with the evidence of Suetonius. It is not inconsistent with

the evidence of Tacitus. It also agrees better with the Christian tradition, which accumulates its memories of persecution on the heads of Nero and Domitian, and is quite silent about Domitian's father and brother. Lastly, it appears that the developed policy might grow naturally and easily out of the original persecution under Nero without needing any further impulse, which is also insufficiently attested. Let me say a word on each of these points.

(i.) There are two other witnesses to the action taken against Christians besides Tacitus. The first is Sulpicius Severus, who, though too late to be of much value as a direct authority, is proved to have had Tacitus before him, and would have access to parts of the work of Tacitus which are no longer extant. Sulpicius describes (after Tacitus) the Neronian persecution, and then adds: "This was the beginning of severe measures against the Christians. Afterwards the religion was forbidden by formal laws, and the profession of Christianity was made illegal by published edicts."¹ The language is probably in any case exaggerated, but the main question is, What is meant by "afterwards"? Prof. Ramsay thinks it means "under subsequent emperors." Possibly, but by no means certainly. Rather the direct evidence of the other witness, Suetonius, seems to point to Nero himself.

Suetonius notes among a number of police regulations issued during the reign of Nero, that "the Christians were visited with punishment—a class of persons addicted to a novel and pernicious superstition."² The reference is not to a single outbreak of violence but to deliberate measures of repression. Prof. Ramsay argues excellently and con-

¹ *Chron.* ii. 29: *Hoc initio in Christianos sæviri captum, post etiam datis legibus religio vetabatur, palamque edictis propositis Christianum esse non licebat.*

² *Nero* 16: *Afflicti suppliciis Christiani, genus hominum superstitionis novæ ac maleficæ.*

clusively that these measures were intended to be permanent, and that they were part of a settled policy. Indeed from this time he dates the continued persecution of Christians.

But if so, does it not follow from the language of Suetonius that Christians were punished *as such*? Their crime was that they were Christians—members of "a new and noxious sect." If they [had been punished for anything else, surely the ordinary regulations would have sufficed. If they were punished not for the Name but for "crimes attaching to the name," there would be nothing to distinguish them from ordinary wrongdoers. There would have been no need to give special instructions about them. The language of Suetonius implies the creation of a new offence.

(ii.) But, it is argued, Tacitus lays stress upon the *flagitia*. The first victims no doubt suffered on the specific charge of incendiarism. But the persecution went on. Others were implicated and charged, no longer with incendiarism, but with hatred of the human race.¹

I submit that we see here the origin of the name of Christian being regarded as penal. Incendiarism is a definite charge, but hatred of the human race is not. No doubt it included a number of definite acts. I accept Prof. Ramsay's analysis of the meaning of the phrase, and take it as referring especially to the interference of Christianity with family life—with the relations of husband and wife, parent and child. Christianity forbade many things which Paganism permitted, and so was constantly putting barriers and obstacles in the way. How many of the Acts of Martyrs turn upon the jealousy and rage of disappointed

¹ *Annals* xv. 44: *Igitur primum correpti qui fatebantur, deinde indicio eorum multitudo ingens, haud perinde in crimine incendii quam odio humani generis conjuncti sunt.* I believe that Prof. Ramsay is right in keeping *conjuncti* with *Cod. Med.*; *convicti* of course lay near at hand, but does not seem necessary.

suitors! It is easy to understand how popular feeling would be aroused and Christianity branded as anti-social.

But in all this there would be no definite, tangible breach of the law, nothing that in itself would involve the extreme penalty. Of course there were the scandals, *flagitia*, of which Christians were accused. But that which really told would be rather a number of small acts, not in themselves criminal, which were conveniently summed up under such a description as "hatred of the human race." Surely this is only one degree removed from making the Christian name itself penal.

(iii.) Another fact which points in the same direction is that from the first, as Prof. Ramsay states, Christians were "sought out." Crimes did not need seeking out—they obtruded themselves upon the public eye. To deal with them was part of the regular business of the police. But it did need some search to find out who were Christians and who were not. Prof. Ramsay himself explains in this way the confessions to which Tacitus alludes. The crime to which the victims confessed was not that of causing the fire, but that of being Christians. We are certainly not to believe that every one of those who suffered had some actual *flagitium* brought home to him. His Christianity itself raised a suspicion of *flagitia*. And thus it is difficult to see how a persecution like Nero's could stop short of punishing the mere Christian profession. There can be little doubt that it did so in fact; and the issuing of express regulations on the subject gave a colour of legality to that which would otherwise have looked like wanton cruelty and oppression.

(iv.) All this falls in well with the later Christian tradition which singled out Nero as the typical persecutor, and named no one else between him and Domitian. If Vespasian and Titus had been the first to make Christianity really penal, it is hard to see how they could have been

passed over. No doubt Nero's regulations continued in force, and it is very probable that Christians continued to suffer under them, but not to such an extent as to attract special notice.

I have done my best to argue this question without introducing Christian documents. It is best that it should be so argued, and if possible settled independently of them. At the same time I am aware that the documents themselves are not unaffected by the result. Those most involved are the First Epistle of St. Peter and the Apocalypse.

Prof. Ramsay has an original view about the First Epistle of St. Peter. He thinks that in any case it was written about the year 80 A.D., and he gives us our choice of supposing that, if it is genuine, St. Peter outlived the destruction of Jerusalem; or that if, as is commonly assumed, he died before that event, the Epistle is not genuine.

The reason for fixing upon the date is that the Name is just beginning to be punishable. There is some survival of the old state of things, in which definite allegations were made, but, at the same time, Christians were liable to suffer simply as Christians (1 Pet. iv. 15, 16). How far this holds good will depend upon the answer which is given to our previous argument. If that is successful, I do not see any sufficient reason why the Epistle should not have been written in the year 66 quite as well as in the year 80.

Prof. Ramsay makes use of a hint thrown out in conversation by Dr. Hort. It is true that there is no mention of the year of St. Peter's death. Still I confess that I do not think it easy to prolong his life beyond the year 70. Several writers, Clement of Rome, Dionysius of Corinth, and Irenæus, couple together St. Peter and St. Paul in a way which I think is most natural, if they met their end about the same time. And Irenæus says expressly that St. Mark did not write his Gospel until after the decease (*ἔξοδον*) of

both Apostles.¹ It is true that Clement of Alexandria gives a slightly different version, and makes the Gospel written during the lifetime of St. Peter.² But Irenæus is slightly the older of the two, and had a closer connexion with the Church of Rome, so that we should expect him to have the more accurate knowledge of its traditions. Now, there are many reasons for thinking that the mass of the Second Gospel was already written at the time of the fall of Jerusalem. Indirectly, therefore, I think that we have some evidence—not convincing evidence, but evidence of a certain weight, which I should not like to throw over lightly—for placing the death of St. Peter before that event.

The case of the Apocalypse is more doubtful. I admit that the arguments for dating this under Domitian are strong. The external evidence in particular is both good and explicit. The stress which is laid on the worship of the emperor (Rev. xiii. 14, xiv. 9, xv. 2, xvi. 2, etc.) also looks rather more like the reign of Domitian than that of Nero or Galba.³ And there are other reasons.

And yet twenty years ago the great majority of the more trustworthy scholars were in favour of placing it under Galba in the year 69 A.D. There is still, I cannot help thinking, a great deal to be said in favour of that view. But I am in doubt myself, and I am ready to be convinced. Of course, if Prof. Ramsay is right, the earlier date must be abandoned. But I would rather see that question argued out on its own merits first.

(3) If the deliberate attempts to suppress Christianity began under emperors like Vespasian and Titus, we may be pretty sure that they had a statesmanlike motive. And Prof. Ramsay finds that motive in the consciousness on the

¹ *Adv. Hær.*, iii. 1, 1.

² *Ap. Eus.*, *H. E.*, ii. 15.

³ Yet the worship of the emperor was always going on, and was at its worst in the province of Asia. We can easily imagine how a Jew fresh from Palestine, where it was kept out of sight as much as possible, would be shocked at it,

part of the government of the formidable strength of the Christian organization.

I cannot help thinking that Prof. Ramsay somewhat exaggerates, or at least antedates, this consciousness. He dismisses rather severely an objection of Aubé's, "who thinks it inconceivable that Nero should have already begun to suspect that the growth of the organized Christian religion might prove dangerous to the Empire" (p. 358). I am afraid that I should have to associate myself with this scepticism, which Prof. Ramsay thinks unreasonable. It is true that he draws a graphic and excellent picture of the amount of intercommunication between the Churches (p. 365 f.). But intercommunication, apart from organization, would not be thought a dangerous feature. And on Professor Ramsay's own showing, at this earlier date the organization must have been still very immature.

I can accept the sketch which is given on p. 363 of the organization as it existed about the year 170 A.D., provided that we remember that it was a state of things not long established, but only just being reached. We must remember in particular that councils or synods were only just beginning to be held in connexion with the measures taken against Montanism, and that they were at first only local meetings of a few neighbouring bishops. I can perfectly understand that the Church might be thought to be a dangerous organization by the time of Maximinus Thrax (235 A.D.); but I doubt if it was so even in the time of Trajan. If it had been, surely that vigorous emperor would have pursued a different policy. Instead of practically letting Christianity alone, he would have kept at least a vigilant watch upon it. And what is true of Trajan would be true *a fortiori* of Vespasian. Is it not enough that Christianity should be regarded as noxious, without supposing that it was also regarded as dangerous?

But Prof. Ramsay sees rightly that the centre of the

Church organization was the bishops. It was they who really bound together the federated societies. And yet he himself thinks that by the time of Ignatius the episcopal office was but very partially developed.

He has a new and interesting, but I cannot think wholly tenable, view of the origin of the Episcopate. His idea is that the *episcopus* did not originally hold any permanent office, but that the name was given to any presbyter appointed to perform a special duty. The most important of these special duties was that of communicating with other Churches; so that we should have a good example of the *episcopus* in Clement of Rome penning his letter in the name of the Roman Church to the Church at Corinth, or when Hermas hands over his "booklet" to Clement for transmission to foreign Churches.

My difficulty in regard to this view is threefold. (i.) I do not think that there is any evidence of the use of the term *episcopus* in connexion with the discharge of these special and temporary duties. From the time of Ignatius onwards there are many examples of the bishop corresponding with other Churches; but by this time he was the representative of the Church, and as such would naturally be its spokesman. It is less clear that he wrote in his special capacity as bishop. The two letters, from the Church of Smyrna with an account of the death of Polycarp, and from the Churches of Vienne and Lyons with details of the persecution of 177 A.D., were both written, so far as appears, without the intervention of a bishop. And in Cyprian's correspondence there are a number of letters addressed to and from "presbyters and deacons," "confessors and martyrs," etc. We know too that Novatian took a leading part in the correspondence of the Church of Rome before his election as bishop. Even in the case of Clement there is nothing to connect his writing of letters with the duties of a bishop beyond the fact that he is called "bishop" in the later lists of the Roman succession.

(ii.) The evidence for the existence of *episcopoi* as definite and permanent officers of the local Church, I should have thought, went back to the Epistle to the Philippians and the *Didache*. St. Paul sends greeting to "all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the *episcopoi* and *diaconoi*" (Phil. i. 1). Can we think that he means by this anything short of the holders of permanent office? The holders of a merely temporary commission, created for the occasion and lapsing with it, would hardly have been singled out in this way. Again, the *Didache* (xv. 1, 2) speaks of the election of bishops and deacons, and compares them with prophets and teachers, in terms which seem to imply permanence.

(iii.) The great problem in regard to the *Episcopate* is how it came to be *monarchical*. How did the single *episcopos* come to take the place of the plurality of *episcopoi*? Prof. Ramsay's theory would only accentuate this difficulty, and would do nothing to remove it. If at first for every separate duty there was some one separately deputed, we are as far removed as possible from the concentration of a variety of functions in a single individual.

I have stated my difficulties quite frankly, with no wish to maintain them obstinately, or to put them forward as if they were in any respect final, but only with a view to contribute towards that thorough discussion and testing of his positions which I know that Prof. Ramsay himself would desire.

I lay down his book with warm and sincere admiration. He has succeeded in investing a number of critical discussions with extraordinary vividness and reality. He has done so because he writes always "with his eye upon the object," and that an object seen in the light of knowledge which in its own special sphere (the geography of Asia Minor and Roman administration) is unrivalled.

W. SANDAY.

PAUL'S CONCEPTION OF CHRISTIANITY.

VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS—THE TRAIN OF
THOUGHT.

THE theme of the first eight chapters is "the gospel of God," for the whole world, needed by all men, available for all who will receive it in the obedience of faith, and thoroughly efficient in the case of all who so receive it; a gospel which Paul is not ashamed to preach anywhere, because he believes it to be the power of God unto salvation.

The Apostle enters at once on the explanation of the nature of this Gospel. "Therein is revealed a righteousness of God from faith to faith."¹ These words contain only a preliminary hint of Paul's doctrine concerning the Gospel. He does not expect his readers to understand at once what he means by *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*. He simply introduces the topic to provoke curiosity, and create a desire for a further unfolding to be given in due season. Therefore it is better, with the revised version, to translate "a righteousness of God," than with the authorised version, "the righteousness of God," for the idea the words are intended to express is by no means, for the first readers, a familiar theological commonplace, but a peculiar Pauline conception standing in need of careful explanation. Two things however are clearly indicated in this preliminary announcement: that the Gospel, as Paul understands it, is saving through *faith*, and that it is a *universal* Gospel; "a power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek."

Having thus proclaimed the cardinal truth that salvation is through faith, the Apostle proceeds to shut all men up to faith by demonstrating the universality of sin.² The section

¹ i. 17.² i. 18, ii. 24

of the Epistle devoted to this purpose presents a grim repulsive picture of human depravity, and on this account it may appear a most unwelcome and uncongenial feature in a writing having for its express theme the praise of Divine grace. But this dark unpleasant excursus is relevant and necessary to the argument in hand. What more directly fitted to commend the Pauline doctrine both as to the gracious nature and the universal destination of the Gospel than a proof of the universal prevalence of sin? If sin be universal, then God's grace seems the only open way to salvation, and no ground can be found in man why the way should not be equally open to all. There is no moral difference worth mentioning, all distinctions disappear in presence of the one all-embracing category *sinners*. However disagreeable, therefore, it may be to have it elaborately proved that that category does embrace all, however unpleasant reading the proof may be, however hideous and humiliating the picture held up to our view, we cannot quarrel with the Apostle's logic, but must be content to take the bitter with the sweet, the dark with the bright. Far from being a blot on the Epistle, this *sin-section*, as we may call it, is one of its merits, when regarded as an attempt at a fuller statement of Paul's conception of the Gospel than any supplied in previous epistles. We miss such a section in the Epistle to the Galatians. Hints of a doctrine of sin are indeed not wanting in that Epistle,¹ but in comparison with the elaborate statement in the Epistle to the Romans they are very scanty, and give hardly an idea of what might be said on the subject. For what we have here is not vague gentle allusions, but a tremendous exhaustive indictment which overwhelms us with shame, and crushes our pride into the dust, the one effect being produced by the description of Gentile sinfulness in chapter

¹ Gal. ii. 15, 16, iii. 10, 19,

i. vv. 18-32, the other by the description of Jewish sinfulness in the two following chapters.

Remarkable in the former of these two delineations is the exact knowledge displayed by the Apostle of the hideous depravity of Pagan morals, and also the unshrinking way in which he speaks of it, not hesitating out of false delicacy to allude to the most abominable of Gentile vices, and to call them by their true names. All who know the Greek and Roman literature of the period are aware that Paul's picture of contemporary Paganism in respect both of religion and morals is absolutely faithful to fact. Never perhaps in the history of the world did mankind sink so low in superstition and immorality as in the apostolic age; and it was fitting that the Apostle of the Gentiles should say what he thought of it in an Epistle to the Romans, for in the city of Rome the folly and wickedness of mankind reached their maximum. "The first age," writes Renan, "of our era has an infernal stamp which belongs to it alone; the age of Borgia alone can be compared to it in point of wickedness."¹ Surely it could not be difficult for men immersed in such a foul pit of senile superstition and unblushing profligacy to attain such a sense of guilt as should make them feel that their only hope of salvation lay in the mercy of God! But, alas, men get accustomed to evil, and are apt to regard all as right that is in fashion. A moral tonic is needed to invigorate conscience, and produce a healthy reaction of the moral sense against prevalent evil. This the Apostle understood well, hence the abrupt reference to the wrath of God immediately after the initial statement of the nature of the Gospel.² Here, as in reference to the whole sin-section, one's first impression is apt to be: how ungenial, what a lack of tact in thrusting

¹ *Melanges*, p. 167.

² *Rom.* i. 18. The idea of a revelation of wrath will be discussed at a later stage.

in such unwelcome thoughts in connection with the good tidings of salvation! But Paul knows what he is about, and his usual tact is not likely to have deserted him at the very outset of so carefully considered a writing. He knows that his Gospel will be welcomed only by those to whom the prevalent life of the age appears utterly black and abominable. The first thing therefore to be done is to call forth the slumbering conscience into vigorous action. For this purpose he prefaces his description of Pagan manners by a blunt down right expression of his own moral judgment upon them, pronouncing them to be the legitimate object of Divine wrath.

In his indictment against the Gentile world Paul has no difficulty in making out a case, his only difficulty is in making the picture black enough. But when he passes from Gentiles to Jews his task becomes more delicate. He has now to deal with a people accustomed to speak of Gentiles as "sinners," and to think of themselves by comparison as righteous, and who could read such a description of Pagan morals as he has just given with self-complacent satisfaction. Therefore he makes this very state of mind his starting point in addressing himself to his countrymen, and begins his demonstration of Jewish sinfulness by a statement amounting to a charge of hypocrisy. In effect he says: "I know what you are thinking, O ye Jews, as ye read these damning sentences about Pagans. 'Oh,' think ye, 'these wicked Gentiles! thank God, we are not like them.' But I tell you you *are* like them, in the essentials of conduct if not in special details, and to all this you add the sin of hypocritical censoriousness, judging others while you ought rather to be judging yourselves." It is noticeable that, though plainly alluded to, the Jew is not named. The reason may be that the Apostle wishes absolutely to deny the right of any man to judge others; as if he would say: "the heathen are bad, but where is the man who has

a right to cast stones at his brother man?" He knows very well where the men who claim such a right are to be found. He does not at first say where, but it goes without being said, every Jew reading the Epistle would know, for he would be conscious that he had just been doing the thing condemned. Having denounced the Jewish vice of judging, Paul goes on by a series of interrogations to charge Jews with the same sins previously laid to the charge of the Gentiles.¹ These implied assertions may seem a libel on a people proud of their God-given law; but doubtless the Apostle was well informed as to the state of Jewish morality, and spoke as one conscious that he had no reason to fear contradiction.

It is important to notice that Paul's purpose in this section is not simply to prove that both Pagans and Jews are great sinners, but to show that they are such sinners in spite of all in their respective religions that tended to keep them in the right way. He pronounces a verdict not merely on men but on systems, and means to suggest that both Paganism and Judaism are failures. He holds that even Paganism contained some elements of truth making for right conduct. He credits the Gentiles with some natural knowledge of God and of duty.² His charge against them is that they held or held down³ the truth in unrighteousness, and were unwilling to retain God in their knowledge. It may be thought that Paul's judgment of the Pagan world is too pessimistic, and that there was a brighter side to the picture which he did not sufficiently take into account. But in any case it is to be observed that his pessimism does not take the form of denying that the Pagans had any light, but rather that of accusing them of not being faithful to the light they had.

To the Jew the Apostle concedes a still higher measure of

¹ *Rom.* ii. 21-23.

² i. 19-21, ii. 14, 15.

³ i. 18, *κατεχόντων*.

light, representing him as having the great advantage over the Pagan of being in possession of the oracles of God.¹ But he is far from thinking that in this fact the Jew has any ground for assuming airs of superiority as compared with the Gentile. He alludes to the privilege with no intention of playing the part of a special pleader for his race.² On the contrary, he holds that the people who were in possession of the law and the promises and the Scriptures were just on that account the more to be blamed for their misconduct. For the benefit of such as made these privileges a ground of self-complacency he points out that the very Scriptures of which they were so proud brought against the favoured race charges not less severe than he had just brought against the Pagan world.³

Paul concludes his sombre survey of the moral condition of the world with a solemn statement, declaring justification by works of law impossible.⁴ It is the negative side of his doctrine of justification based on his doctrine of sin. It applies in the first place and directly to Jews, but by implication and *a fortiori* to Gentiles.

Having reached the negative conclusion, the Apostle proceeds to state his positive doctrine of salvation in one of the great passages of the Epistle, chapter iii 21-26, which must occupy our attention hereafter. Here let it be remarked that we get from this great Pauline text more light on the expression we met with at the commencement of "a righteousness of God." We now begin to understand what this righteousness is, which Paul regards as the burthen of his Gospel. He evidently feels that the expression in itself does not necessarily convey the meaning he attaches to it, for no sooner has he used it than he hastens to add words

¹ iii. 1, 2.

² iii. 9. Such seems to be the meaning of *προεχόμεθα*, "are we making excuses for ourselves?" that is, for the people who had the *λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ*. *Vid.* the elaborate discussion on this word in Morison's monograph on *Romans* iii.

³ iii. 10-18.

⁴ iii. 20.

explanatory of his meaning. "By a righteousness of God," he says in effect, "I mean a righteousness through faith of Christ, unto all believers in Christ." God's righteousness, in Paul's sense, does not appear to signify God's personal righteousness, or our personal righteousness conceived of as well pleasing to God, but a righteousness which God gives to those who believe in Jesus; an *objective* righteousness we may call it, not in us, but as it were hovering over us. It seems to be something original the Apostle has in mind, for he labours to express his thought about it by a variety of phrases: saying, *e.g.*, that it is a righteousness apart from law, and yet a righteousness witnessed to both by law and by prophets, how or where, he does not here state. Further, he represents it as given to faith. Faith is its sole condition, therefore it is given to *all* who believe, Jew and Gentile alike. Again he speaks of men as made partakers of God's righteousness, *δικαιούμενοι*, "justified," *freely*, by His *grace*, which is as much as to say that the righteousness in question is a gift of divine love offered freely to all who believe in Jesus.

Apart from law this righteousness of God is revealed according to the Apostle, who lays great stress on the doctrine, as he feels that otherwise God and salvation would be a monopoly of the Jews.¹ Yet one cannot but note that he is very careful in this Epistle to avoid creating the impression that he undervalues law. Significant in this connection is the twice-used expression "the obedience of faith,"² also the curious phrase the "law of faith,"³ by which boasting is said to be excluded; also the earnestness with which the Apostle protests that by his doctrine he does not make void the law through faith, but rather establishes

¹ iii. 29.

² i. 5, xvi. 26.

³ iii. 27. Compare the expression νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς (chap. viii. 2). These various expressions seem to indicate a desire to dissociate the idea of law from legalism, and to invest it with evangetic associations.

the law.¹ The proof of the statement is held over for a more advanced stage of the argument, as is also the proof of the thesis that by the law is the knowledge of sin.² The point to be noticed is the Apostle's anxiety to prevent the rise of any prejudicial misunderstanding. It is explained in part by the irenical policy demanded by the situation in view of the writer, in part possibly by his recollecting that he writes to men who as Romans had an inbred reverence for law.

What follows in chapters iv. and v. may be summarised under the general heading of support to the doctrine of justification by faith. The support is threefold, being drawn (1) from the history of Abraham (chap. iv.); (2) from the experience of the justified (chap. v. 1-11); (3) from the history of the human race (chap. v. 12-21). The first two lines of thought are anticipated in *Galatians* (chap. iii. 6-9, 3-5), the third is new, though texts in 1 Corinthians xv. concerning Adam and Christ show that such sweeping generalisations do not occur here for the first time to the Apostle's mind.

"What of Abraham our forefather?"³ so begins abruptly the new section. Is he no exception to the rule, that no man is justified by works? The Jews thought he was, and Paul seems willing to concede the point out of respect to the patriarch, but not in a sense incompatible with his thesis.⁴ Abraham as compared with other men might have in his works a ground of boasting, but not before God, not so as to exclude need of Divine grace, not in the sense of a full legal justification. He was justified before circumci-

¹ iii. 31.

² iii. 20.

³ iv. 1. *εὐρηκέναι* is omitted by Westcott and Hort.

⁴ So Lipsius, *Die Paul. Rechtfertigungslehre*, p. 35, with which cf. the same author in *Hand-commentar*. According to Weber, *Die Lehre des Talmuds*, p. 224, the Jews of the Talmudic period thought that all the patriarchs passed through life without sin, also other great saints, such as Elijah.

sion, and by faith ; and so he was not merely the fleshly father of Israel, but the spiritual father of all who believe, circumcised and uncircumcised. In the discussion of these points, there comes out in a remarkable degree a feature of Paul's style on which critics have commented, viz., the tendency to repeat a word that has taken a strong hold of his mind. "A word," says Renan, "haunts him, he uses it again and again in the same page. It is not from sterility, it is from the eagerness of his spirit, and his complete indifference as to the correction of style."¹ The word which haunts his mind here is λογίζομαι, which in one form or another occurs eleven times. The repetition implies emphasis, implies that the word is the symbol of an important idea in the Pauline system of thought, that it denotes a certain feature of the righteousness of God given to faith. It is an *imputed* righteousness, though strictly speaking Paul's idea is that *faith is imputed for righteousness*. So it was in the case of Abraham, according to the Scriptures ; so in like manner, the Apostle teaches, shall it be in the case of all Abraham's spiritual children.² For he regards the patriarch's case as in all respects typical, even in respect of the nature and manifestations of the faith exercised, as when he believed in God's power to quicken the dead, even as we do when we believe in the resurrection of Jesus.³ Who, adds the Apostle, in one of his pregnant sentences : "*Who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised again for our justification.*"⁴

The way of justification by faith exemplified in the history of Abraham, is, the Apostle goes on to show, still further commended by its results in a believing man's experience. The style at this point passes out of the didactic into the

¹ *St. Paul*, p. 233.

² *Rom.* iv. 24.

³ *iv.* 24.

⁴ *iv.* 25. This text will come under our notice hereafter.

emotional. The writer expresses himself as one who has known what it is to enter into a state of peace, hope and joy, from a miserable state of fear, doubt, uncertainty and depression, the sad inheritance of legalism. So in cheerful buoyant tone he begins: "Justification being by faith, let us have peace with God,"¹ insisting that it is now possible and easy as it never was or could be for the legalist. And he continues in triumphant strain to exhibit the mood of the believer in Jesus as one of constant many-sided exultation. The keynote of this noble outpouring of an emancipated heart is *καυχῶμαι*, occurring first in *v. 2*, and recurring in *vv. 3* and *11*, and presenting in its growing intensity of meaning a veritable Jacob's ladder of joy reaching from earth to heaven. "We exult in hope of future glory; not only so, we exult in present tribulations; not only so, we exult in God. The future is ours, the present is ours, all is ours because God is ours; all this because we have abandoned the way of works and entered on the way of faith." Such is the skeleton of thought in this choice passage, well hidden by a massive body of superadded ideas crowding into the writer's mind and craving utterance.

The famous parallel between Adam and Christ comes in partly as an afterthought by way of an additional contribution to the doctrine of sin, and therefore to the argument in support of the doctrine of justification. But it may also be viewed as a continuation of the foregoing strain in which Christian optimism finds for itself new pabulum in a larger field. "It is well not only for the individual believer that salvation comes through faith in Christ, but for the human race. Christ is the hope of all generations of mankind. Through one man at the commencement of history came sin and death, and through this second Man come righteousness and life. The law did nothing to help sin- and death-

¹ *v. 1*, *ἔχωμεν* suits the emotional character of the passage. In didactic meaning it comes to the same thing as *ἔχομεν*.

stricken humanity, it rather entered that sin might abound, so enhancing rather than mitigating its malign power. But that was merely a temporary evil, for the abounding of sin only called forth a superabundant manifestation of grace. Thus Adam and Moses, each in his own way, ministered to the glory of Christ as the Redeemer from sin." Such is the gist of the passage.

The Apostle's thought is grand, bold, and true, but like all bold thought it brings its own risks of misunderstanding. What if this eulogium on the righteousness of God given to faith, or on the grace of God the more liberally bestowed the more it is needed, should be turned into an excuse for moral license? Why then Christianity would prove to be a failure not less than Paganism and Judaism; nay, the greatest, most tragic failure of all. Paul has judged Paganism and Judaism by their practical fruits, and he cannot object to the same test being applied to the new religion he proposes to put in their place. Obviously it must be a matter of life and death for him to show that the Gospel he preaches will stand the test. That, accordingly, is the task he next undertakes, with what success the contents of chapters vi.-viii. enable us to judge.

Chapters vi. and vii. deal successively with three questions naturally arising out of the previous train of thought. It is not necessary to suppose that they had ever been put by any actual objector—the dialectics are those of Paul's own eager intellect; but conceived as emanating from an unsympathetic reader they may be stated thus: The great matter, it seems, is that grace abound, had we not better then all play Adam's part that grace may have free scope? ¹ The law too was given to make sin abound, and having rendered that questionable service retired from the stage and gave place to the genial reign of grace. Are we then

¹ *Rom.* vi. 1.

at liberty now to do deeds contrary to the law? ¹ Finally, if the function of the law was to increase sin, is not the natural inference that the law itself is sin? ² The Apostle's reply to the first of these questions is in effect this: "Continue in sin that grace may abound! the idea is abhorrent to the Christian mind; the case supposed absurd and impossible. Ideally viewed, a Christian is a man dead to sin and alive in and with Christ. That this is so, baptism signifies. The Christian life in its ideal is a repetition of Christ's life in its main crises; in its death for sin and to sin, and in its resurrection to eternal life. And the ideal becomes a law to all believers. They deem it their duty to strive to realise the ideal in their life." At this point in the development of Paul's thoughts we make the acquaintance of that "*faith-mysticism*" which is a not less conspicuous feature of Paulinism than the doctrine of objective righteousness, or justification by faith. We met it before for a moment in the Antioch remonstrance, in those stirring words, "I am crucified along with Christ"; ³ and again, just for a passing moment, in the pregnant saying: "if one died for all, then all died along with Him." ⁴ But here we are brought face to face with it so that we cannot escape noting its features, and are compelled to recognise it as an organic and essential element in the Pauline conception of Christianity.

The second suggestion, that we may sin because we are not under law, the Apostle boldly meets by the assertion that just because we are not under law but under grace therefore sin shall not have dominion over us. The announcement of this to a Jew startling, but to a Christian self-evident, truth conducts the Apostle at length to his doctrine as to the function of the law which he has once and again hinted at in the course of his argument. He uses

¹ vi. 15.

² vii. 7.

³ Gal. ii. 20.

⁴ 2 Cor. v. 15.

for his purpose the figure of a marriage. The law was once our husband, but he is dead and we are married to another, even Christ, through whom we bring forth fruit to God; very different fruit from that brought forth under the law's influence, which was simply fruit of sin unto death.¹ In so characterising the fruit of marriage to the law Paul is simply repeating his doctrine that the law entered that sin might abound. This doctrine, therefore, he must now explain and defend, which he does in one of the most remarkable passages in all his writings, wherein he describes the conflict between the flesh and the spirit and the function of the law in provoking sin, while holy in itself, through the flesh.² It is the *locus classicus* of Paul's doctrine of the flesh as also of his doctrine of the law, and as such must engage our attention hereafter. It is altogether a very sombre and depressing utterance, ending with the cry of despair: "Wretched man, who shall deliver me!"

The exposition of the Gospel cannot so end. To let that be the last word were to confess failure. The exclamation: "Thanks to God through Jesus Christ" must be made the starting point of a new strain in which despair shall give place to hope, and struggle to victory. This is what happens in chapter viii. The Apostle here returns to the happy mood of chapter v. 1-11. "There is now no condemnation" is an echo of "Being justified by faith, we have peace," and the subsequent series of reflections is an expansion of the three ideas, rejoicing in hope, rejoicing in tribulation, rejoicing in God. Yet along with similarity goes notable difference due to the influence of the intervening train of thought. In the earlier place the ground of joy and hope is *objective*, the righteousness of God given to faith, faith imputed for righteousness. In the latter it is *subjective*, union to Christ by faith, being in Christ, *having*

¹ Rom. vii. 1-6.

² vii. 7-24.

Christ's spirit dwelling in us. The great Pauline doctrine of the spirit immanent in believers as the source of a new Christlike life here finds adequate expression, after having been hinted in the Epistle to the Galatians,¹ and also in an earlier place of this present Epistle.² Here the indwelling Spirit is set forth as the source of several important spiritual benefits: (1) victory over sin, power to do the will of God, to fulfil the righteousness of the law³ (the law is not to be made void after all, but established!); (2) filial confidence towards God;⁴ (3) the sure hope of future glory as God's sons and heirs;⁵ (4) comfort under present tribulation, the spirit helping us in our infirmities.⁶ Along with this doctrine of the immanent Spirit goes a magnificent doctrine of Christian optimism which proclaims the approach of an era of emancipation for the whole creation, and the present reign of a Paternal Providence which makes all things work together for good.⁷ Here Paul's spirit rises to the highest pitch of jubilant utterance, illustrating what he meant when he spoke of glorying in God (v. 11), "If God be for us, who can be against us . . . I am persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Jesus Christ our Lord."⁸

Thus, on eagle wing does Paul soar away towards heaven, whence he looks down with contempt on time and sense, and all the troubles of this life. But such lofty flights of faith and hope seldom last long in this world. Something

¹ Gal. iv. 6, v. 5.

² Rom. v. 5.

³ viii. 4-10.

⁴ viii. 14-16.

⁵ viii. 17.

⁶ viii. 26.

⁷ viii. 18-25, 31-39.

⁸ viii. 31, 39. In this brief analysis of chapter viii. no reference has been made to a very important Pauline word in *vv.* 3, 4: "God sending His own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh." Other opportunities will occur for discussing this passage.

ever occurs to bring the spirit down from heaven to earth, back from the glorious future to the sad present. Even such was Paul's experience in writing this letter. What brings his thoughts down to the earth, and back to the disenchanting realities of the present is the prevailing unbelief of his countrymen. In the peace-giving faith and inspiring hope of Christians few of them had a share. The sad fact not only grieved his spirit, but raised an important apologetic problem. The nature of the problem has been indicated in a previous paper, as also the gist of the Apostle's solution as given in chapters ix.-xi., the further exposition of which is reserved for a future occasion.

A. B. BRUCE.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF EZRA II. AND IV. 6-23.

I.

THE Book of Ezra, which has undoubted difficulties, chronological and others, has been more obscured by the mistakes of commentators than any other book in the Bible. The two main difficulties with which it is proposed to deal in the following paper, are that of Ezr. ii. as compared with Neh. vii., and that of Ezr. iv. 6-23. The writer believes that the solution in both cases is, in the main, quite certain, and capable of demonstration.

To take, first, Ezr. ii. The difficulty here arises from the fact that this chapter is a duplicate of Neh. vii., and that whereas in Neh. vii. the action is avowedly and manifestly laid in the time of Nehemiah "the Tirshatha," the Governor of Judea in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, King of Persia; in Ezr. ii. it appears to be laid in the time of Zerubbabel and Jeshua in the reign of Cyrus King of Persia, some ninety years before.

The first question that arises is, Are the two passages identical in the sense that one is borrowed from the other? And if so, in which book is it original, and in which borrowed and transcribed from the other?

Now that the two passages are identical, in spite of some variations in the numbers, appears from a close comparison of the two verse by verse. And we will begin with what is perhaps the most significant part of the two chapters, viz. the account of the offerings for the Temple service described in Ezr. ii. 68, 69, Neh. vii. 70, 72.¹

Premising that the *numbers* in both chapters are more or less corrupt and uncertain, both here and throughout the two chapters, I would observe that the key to the restora-

¹ See the writer's articles in the *Dict. of the Bible*; "Ezra, book of"; "Nehemiah, book of,"

tion in these verses is to remember that the offerings (as we learn from Neh. vii.) consisted of three, in the main, equal parts; one given by the Tirshatha, one by the chief of the fathers, and one by the rest of the people. Ezra abridges the account and only gives the sum total of the gifts. But a comparison of the sum total with the items given by Nehemiah shows at once that the 61,000 drams of gold consisted of three offerings of 20,000 each, *plus* 1,000 which, we gather from Neh. vii. 70, was contributed by the Tirshatha over and above his share. The שְׁתֵּי רִבּוֹת “two myriads,” or 20,000, which ought to have preceded the אֶלֶף “a thousand,” has dropped out of the text.

To take next the priests' garments, Ezr. ii. 69. The total is there given as 100, which is confirmed by 1 Esdr. v. 45. But in Neh. vii. 70, 72, there is attributed to the Tirshatha 530 priests' garments, and to the rest of the people 67. Now 67 is two-thirds of 100. Surely it is scarcely doubtful that in Neh. vii. 70 is to be found the other third, viz. 33, and that the 500 does not belong to the priests' garments at all, but is the numeral really belonging to some other kind of gift which has fallen out of the text.

The third article, the 5,000 lbs. of silver, is not quite so easily explained, but we may find a probable explanation.

The total in Ezr. ii. 69, with which 1 Esdr. v. 45 agrees, is 5,000 lbs. of silver. The items in Neh. vii. 71, 72 are, the chief of the fathers 2,200 lbs., the rest of the people 2,000, the Tirshatha nothing. Now if the chief of the fathers, and the rest of the people, gave each $2,250 = 4,500$,¹ there would remain 500 for the Tirshatha to make up the 5,000. And this would account for the stray חֲמִישׁ מֵאוֹת, “500” of Neh. vii. 70, which we have just seen was improperly attached to the priests' garments given by the Tirshatha. The reason why the Tirshatha gave only 500 lbs. to meet the 4,500 of the fathers and the people, was that he gave in

¹ The LXX. ascribe 2,300 to the fathers, and 2,200 to the people = 4,500.

addition "50 basons." If these were of gold, like the "100 basons of gold" made by King Solomon (2 Chr. ix. 8), as their small number rather indicates (comp. Ezr. i. 10), the value of 50 gold basons would far exceed the 2,000 lbs. of silver by which the Tirshatha's contribution fell short of those of the fathers and the people.

The subjoined table shows at a glance the different statements of the gifts in Ezr., Neh. and 1 Esdr., and also either the carelessness of the scribes, or the illegible state of the MS. which they were copying.

EZRA II. 69.	NEHEMIAH VII. 70, 72.	1 ESDRAS V.
Drams of gold 61,000	Drams of gold—	Pounds of gold 1,000
Pounds of silver 5,000	Tirshatha 1,000	Pounds of silver 5,000
Priests' garments 100	Fathers 20,000	Priests' garments 100
	People 20,000	
	————— 41,000	
	Pounds of silver—	
	Fathers 2,200	
	People 2,000	
	————— 4,200	
	Priests' garments 67	

The incident of the Tirshatha's decision concerning the priests who could not find their register in the official genealogy is so manifestly the same in Ezr. ii. 61-63 and Neh. vii. 63-65, that nothing more need here be said about it.

The identity of the numbers in Ezr. ii. 64-67 and Neh. vii. 66, 67 (with one exception noticed below), is no less conclusive.

The same lesson as to the identity of the two documents is taught by a comparison of them verse by verse.

Ezr. ii. 1, 2, which is the description of the whole document, is identical with Neh. vii. 6, 7, except in writing *Azariah* for *Seraiah*, *Reelaiah* for *Raamiah* (ר for ז), *Mizpar* for *Mizpereth*, *Rehum* for *Nehum*, and the omission of *Nahamani*; all manifestly clerical variations.

Ezr. ii. 3, 4, is identical with Neh. vii. 8, 9, both in names and numbers.

Ezr. ii. 5, gives the number of the children of Arah as 775 instead of 652, as in Neh. xii. 10 ; of which a probable explanation is that **חֲמִשָּׁה וְשִׁבְעִים** "five and seventy," is a mistake for the usual order **חֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁבְעָה** "fifty-seven," and **שִׁבְעִים** for the very similar **שְׁנַיִם**. The mistake of *seven* hundred for *six* hundred might easily be caused by the eye resting upon the *seven* in the same verse.

Ezr. ii. 6 is identical with Neh. vii. 11, except in the substitution of **שְׁנַיִם** for **שְׁמֹנֶה**, *twelve* for *eighteen*, where Ezra may probably be right.

Ezr. ii. 7 is identical with Neh. vii. 12.

Ezr. ii. 8 is identical with Neh. vii. 13, except in the substitution of **תֵּשַׁע** "nine" for **שְׁמֹנֶה** "eight"—945 for 845, where again Ezra may be right, the scribe in Nehemiah being misled by the 800 in *v.* 8.

Ezr. ii. 9 is identical with Neh. vii. 14.

Ezr. ii. 10 is identical with Neh. vii. 15, except in reading **בְּנֵי** Bani, for **בְּנֵי** Binnui, and **שְׁנַיִם** *two*, for **שְׁמֹנֶה** *eight*. 642 for 648, mere clerical variations.

Ezr. ii. 11 is identical with Neh. vii. 16, except in reading **שְׁלֹשָׁה** *three* for **שְׁמֹנֶה** *eight*, 623 for 628.

Ezr. ii. 12 is identical with Neh. vii. 17, except in reading **אַלְפֵי** *a thousand* for **אַלְפִּים** *two thousand*, and **מֵאתַיִם** *two hundred* for **שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת** *three hundred*: 1,222 for 2,322.

Ezr. ii. 13 is identical with Neh. vii. 18, except in reading **שֵׁשׁ** *six* for **שִׁבְעָה** *seven*; 666 for 667.

Ezr. ii. 14 is identical with Neh. vii. 19, except in reading **חֲמִשִּׁים וְשִׁשָּׁה** *fifty-six* for **שִׁשִּׁים וְשִׁבְעָה** *sixty-seven*: 2,056 for 2,067, putting the unit 6 for the ten 60, and then the sequence 56 for 67.

Ezr. ii. 15 has 454 instead of 655 in Neh. vii. 20.

Ezr. ii. 16 is identical with Neh. vii. 21.

Ezr. ii. 17 is identical with Neh. vii. 23, except in Bezai

preceding Hashum, and in reading *שְׁלֹשָׁה* *three* for *אַרְבָּעָה* *four*, perhaps from having the first *three* (300) in his mind.

Ezr. ii. 18 corresponds with Neh. vii. 24, except in reading *יֹרָה* *Jorah* for *הָרִיף* *Hariph*—names thought to be of identical meaning (Simonis, Fürst).

Ezr. ii. 19 differs from Neh. vii. 22 in Hashum succeeding *Jorah* (= *Hariph*), instead of preceding *Bezai*, and in reading *מֵאָתַיִם* *two hundred* for *שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת* *three hundred*; and *שְׁלֹשָׁה* *three* for *שְׁמֹנֶה* *eight*, 223 for 328.

Ezr. ii. 20 is identical with Neh. vii. 25, except in reading *גִּבְרָ* *Gibbar* for *גִּבְעוֹן* *Gibeon*.

Ezr. ii. 21, 22 is identical with Neh. vii. 26, except that the total in Ezra is 179 instead of 188 as in Nehemiah.

Ezr. ii. 23 is identical with Neh. vii. 29.

Ezr. ii. 24 is identical with Neh. vii. 28, except in having *Azmaveth* instead of *Beth-azmaveth*.

Ezr. ii. 25-27 is identical with Neh. vii. 29-31.

Ezr. ii. 28 is identical with Neh. vii. 32, except in reading *מֵאָתַיִם* for *מֵאָה*: 200 for 100.

Ezr. ii. 29 is identical with Neh. vii. 33, except in omitting "*the other*," which seems to be a mistake in Nehemiah.

Ezr. ii. 30 has nothing to correspond with it in Nehemiah. The name *Magbish* is perhaps the same as *Magpiash*, Neh. x. 20.

Ezr. ii. 31 is identical with Neh. vii. 34, and 32 with 35.

Ezr. ii. 33 is identical with Neh. vii. 37, except in having *חֲמִשָּׁה* *five* for *אֶחָד* *one*. The scribe's eye was probably caught by the concluding *five* of v. 34, which precedes this in Nehemiah.

Ezr. ii. 34 is identical with Neh. vii. 36, except in its order.

Ezr. ii. 35 is identical with Neh. vii. 38, except in reading *שֵׁשׁ* *six* for *תֵּשַׁע* *nine*, 3,630 for 3,930.

Ezr. ii. 36-39 is identical with Neh. vii. 39-42.

Ezr. ii. 40 is identical with Neh. vii. 43.

Ezr. ii. 41 is identical with Neh. vii. 44, except in reading עֶשְׂרִים *twenty* for אַרְבָּעִים *forty*, 128 for 148.

Ezr. ii. 42 is identical with Neh. vii. 45, except in reading תִּשְׁעָה *nine* for שְׁמֹנֶה *eight*, 139 for 138.

Ezr. ii. 43-45 is identical with Neh. vii. 46-48, except in reading *Akkub* for *Shalmāi* (a manifest mistake, as *Akkub* was one of the families of porters [v. 42]), and a different spelling of *Siaha*, v. 44.

Ezr. ii. 46-54 is identical with Neh. vii. 49-56, except in the insertion in v. 46 of two names, *Hagab* and *Salmai*, which belong to the preceding verse, and the insertion in v. 50 of אֲסָנָה *Asnah*.

Ezr. ii. 55-58 is identical with Neh. vii. 57-60, except one or two quite unimportant differences in spelling.

Ezr. ii. 59-63 is in the main identical with Neh. vii. 61-65, only in v. 60 we read חֲמִשִּׁים *fifty* for אַרְבָּעִים *forty*, 652 for 642.

Ezr. ii. 64-67 is identical with Neh. vii. 66-69, except that Ezr. ii. 65 has "200" singing men and women; Neh. vii. 67 has "245."

Ezr. ii. 68 has a remarkable addition, compared with Neh. vii. 70, 71, viz. the words "when they came to the House of the Lord which is at Jerusalem, offered freely for the House of God to set it up in its place," or rather, "to establish it in its place." See p. 439. There is nothing corresponding to this in Nehemiah, where we are only told that the gifts were "for the work," and were given to "the treasure," and to "the treasure of the work," without specifying what the work was. But the nature of the gifts (Neh. vii. 70, 72) shows plainly that they were for the House of God, viz. basins and priests' garments, and the verbal identity of the two passages shows that they are speaking of the same thing, and are merely variations in the transcripts of the same documents. I place the two

accounts side by side, and mark the identical words by underlining them.

EZR. II. 68, 69.

And some of the chief of the fathers when they were come to the House of the Lord which is at Jerusalem, offered freely for the House of God to set it up in his place. They gave after their ability unto *the treasure of the work* 61,000 drams, etc.

NEH. VII. 70, 71.

And some of the chief of the fathers gave unto the work. The Tirshatha gave to the treasure, etc. And some of the chief of the fathers *gave to the treasure of the work*, etc.

Ezr. ii. 70, iii. 1, 2 is identical with Neh. vii. 73, viii. 1a, except in one most extraordinary respect, which will be seen by placing the two passages side by side, the differences being marked by italics.

EZR. II. 70, III. 1, 2.

So the priests and the Levites, and some of the people, and the singers, and the porters, and the Nethinim dwelt in their cities, and all Israel in their cities; and when the seventh month was come, and the children of Israel were in their cities, the people gathered themselves together as one man *to Jerusalem*. Then stood up *Jeshua . . . and Zerubbabel*, etc.

NEH. VII. 73, VIII. 1.

So the priests, and the Levites, and the porters, and the singers and some of the people, and the Nethinim, and all Israel, dwelt in their cities; and when the seventh month came the children of Israel were in their cities. And all the people gathered themselves together as one man into *the street that was before the water gate*, and they spake unto Ezra the scribe, etc.

The two passages are absolutely identical, word for word (except one or two variations in the order of the words), till you come to the word JERUSALEM in Ezra, which stands for THE STREET THAT WAS BEFORE THE WATER GATE in Nehemiah: when the passage in Ezra goes on to relate what was there done by Jeshua and Zerubbabel in the reign of Cyrus, B.C. 535, but that in Nehemiah what was done by Ezra in the reign of Artaxerxes ninety years afterwards, B.C. 445; an impossible condition of a sound text,

which we shall endeavour to account for by-and-by. But we may safely affirm, as the result of the preceding comparison, that Ezra ii. and Nehemiah vii. are copies of one and the same document.

Our next inquiry is, to which book, Ezra or Nehemiah, does this document belong? and the answer, when we have considered all the circumstances, can only be the unhesitating one, to Nehemiah. Everything goes to prove this. 1. Neh. vii. 5, 6, tells us what was the occasion of Nehemiah's finding and using this document. God, he says, put it into his heart to gather together (to Jerusalem, Ezr. ii. 68) the nobles, rulers, and people, that they might be reckoned by genealogies; and be found, no doubt, among the national archives, a register of the genealogy of them which came up at the first with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and he proceeds to transcribe what he found "written therein," viz. from *v.* 6 to *v.* 60 inclusive. By this register the claims of all those who came up at his bidding "to be reckoned by genealogies" were tried. And it is to be presumed that all passed except those which follow in *vv.* 61-64. There were 642 (652 Ezr. ii. 60) persons who could not prove their birth nor their place in Zerubbabel's register, and so of course could not be entered in Nehemiah's roll. There were also a certain number of persons claiming to be priests who could produce no register of their genealogy, and Nehemiah decided concerning them that they should not eat of the most holy things till there stood up a High Priest with Urim and Thummim to give an authoritative decision as to their claims to the Priesthood. All this is manifestly no part of Zerubbabel's register, but a record of what happened in pursuance of Nehemiah's project in *v.* 5.

But what follows in *vv.* 66-69 is still more conclusive. Commentators have been greatly puzzled by the circumstance that whereas the sum total here given—which is the

same as that in Ezr. ii. 64 and 1 Esdr. v. 41—is 42,360, the items in the preceding list amount only to 31,089, or, as in Ezr. ii., to 29,818—and in 1 Esdr. to 30,000 more or less in different MSS. It has never occurred to them (as far as I know) that the total in *v.* 66 ff. is not the total at all of those in Zerubbabel's list, but the total of those whom Nehemiah "gathered together to reckon them by genealogies" (Neh. vii. 5). This is indicated not only by the obvious probability of the case, and the discrepancy of the numbers, but also by the place in the narrative where the enumeration comes in, at an interval of 4 verses after the close of the list, and by the use of the word *הַקְהָל* "the congregation" (*v.* 66), *i.e.* the assembly whom Nehemiah "gathered together" at Jerusalem (*v.* 5) to reckon them by genealogies.¹ The difference between the sum total of 42,360, and the total of the items, 30,000, represents the increase in the population during the years that had elapsed since Zerubbabel's census was taken. The narrative then proceeds to record further the gifts and offerings of the nobles, rulers and people assembled at Jerusalem (Ezr. ii. 68), and so passes on to the events recorded in ch. viii. and following chapters. Again, the phrase in Ezr. ii. 68, that "the chief of the fathers when they came to the House of the Lord² which is at Jerusalem offered freely," etc., clearly implies that the "House of the Lord" was then standing, which we know it was not in the reign of Cyrus; and so shows that the time spoken of in this chapter was the time of Nehemiah, not that of Zerubbabel. The phrase that follows "to set it up in its place" is apt to mislead the English reader, as if it meant to "build it." But the Hebrew

¹ It is of course possible that the whole number was not actually present at Jerusalem, but only by representation—the heads of families, or the like. The "assembly" at Jerusalem represented 42,360.

² *בֵּית יְהוָה* is different from *בֵּית אֱלֹהִים* Ezr. iii. 2. See Gesen. *Thes.*, under *בֵּית*.

לְהַעֲמִידוֹ עַל-מְכוֹנּוֹ has no such meaning. It implies the existence of that which is to be "set up" or established. See 1 Kings xv. 4; 2 Chr. ix. 8. Another distinct evidence that the transactions here recorded belong to the time of Nehemiah, and not to that of Zerubbabel, is the postponement of the decision about the priests who could not prove their priestly descent "till a High Priest should stand up with Urim and Thummim." This would have been wholly unnecessary in the days of Zerubbabel, because there were the prophets Haggai and Zechariah at hand to decide the question (1 Sam. ix. 9), but in the days of Nehemiah there was no prophet in Israel. Hence the necessity of waiting for an authoritative decision till the Urim and Thummim should be restored.

But the crowning evidence that the chapter belongs to Nehemiah, not to Ezra, is the mention of the Tirshatha. That "the Tirshatha" means Nehemiah, and no one else, is to my apprehension an absolute certainty. It would be to the highest degree probable if we had only Neh. vii. 65 to compare with vii. 5. For who could have authority to decide so grave a question but he who had authority to gather the congregation together? It becomes still more probable when we find that in the matter of the offerings for the Temple service the Tirshatha stood alone; the chief of the fathers standing second; and the whole of the rest of the people standing third. For who could occupy such a place but the great Patriotic Governor of the Jews sent with such a large commission by the Persian king? But if the probability of the Tirshatha being Nehemiah is already so great, what shall we say when in the very next chapter (Neh. viii. 9) we read, "and Nehemiah, which is the Tirshatha," etc.; and again ch. x. 1. "Now those that sealed were Nehemiah the Tirshatha," etc. It becomes an absolute certainty. But if the Tirshatha in Neh. vii. 65, 70, means Nehemiah, how can it mean Zerubbabel, or any

one but Nehemiah, in Ezr. ii. 63, the duplicate passage? And then again if Ezr. ii. treats of Nehemiah, and his sayings and doings, how can it be part of the history of the times of Zerubbabel and Jeshua, and of the reign of Cyrus? The conclusion seems to me quite certain that Ezr. ii. as a whole is out of its place, and belongs not to the book of Ezra, but to that of Nehemiah.

How did it get to its present place? It is obvious from what has just been said that it could not have been placed there by Haggai,¹ who had the charge of the sacred text and of the national annals, because he was dead long before Nehemiah was born. In Haggai's time therefore Ezr. i. 11 was followed immediately by Ezr. iii. 2, which was probably the beginning of Haggai's own work; and the narrative of those times went on to the end of chapter vi., after which there is a long break. But later, perhaps in the reign of Artaxerxes, or even later, after the narrative in Nehemiah had been added to the national annals, the next compiler inserted in its present place in Ezra the roll of the returned captives made in the time of Zerubbabel, ending at Ezr. ii. 58, which was quite germane to his purpose, and caused no confusion. But later still, when perhaps some later genealogy was being added to the book, and there was no prophet to direct, some unskilled hand thought to make things straight by completing the extract down to Neh. vii. 72, and altering Neh. viii. 1, so as to fit on to Ezr. iii. 2. This, or some similar alteration of the ancient text, seems to me the only possible way of explaining the present state of the latter part of Ezr. ii., and Ezr. iii. 1.

I would observe further that if, from reverence for the text of Scripture, any one is ready to go counter to all reasonable criticism, and to accept the grossest improb-

¹ See *Dict. of Bible*, article "Ezra, book of."

abilities, rather than admit any error in the Masoretic text ; is willing to accept Ezr. ii. as belonging in whole to the times of Zerubbabel ; to believe that the Tirshatha means Zerubbabel in Ezra, and Nehemiah in Nehemiah—or that it means Zerubbabel in both, although we are expressly told that it means Nehemiah in Nehemiah, and therefore by implication must mean the same in Ezra—he will find he has made a useless sacrifice, because he will then have the same difficulty, an insuperable one, to deal with with regard to the text of Nehemiah. Neh. vii., viii. 1, are absolutely inexplicable if taken to refer to the time of Cyrus.

We must therefore console ourselves with the thought that this violence was done to the text in very late times, when prophecy had ceased, and that it was done with so little skill that the remedy is easily found.

I ought also to add that the statement to be found in several commentaries that “Tirshatha” is a synonym of תִּרְשָׁתָּה , or Governor, is a gratuitous one, unsupported by any evidence. The LXX., who always translate תִּרְשָׁתָּה ἑπαρχος,¹ only transliterate *Tirshatha* by Ἀθερσασθά, or Ἀρτασασθά, showing that they did not know the meaning of it. The old commentators explain it to mean *cup-bearer*. As it is only found applied to Nehemiah it is more likely that it was the name of some office or dignity peculiar to him than that it was a common synonym of Pekah or Governor, utterly unknown elsewhere.

I sum up by saying that since every difficulty disappears if you take Ezr. ii. as belonging to Nehemiah ; everything falls into its right place ; Nehemiah retains his peculiar designation ; and the most important discrepancy in the numbers disappears ; we cannot help concluding that either by accident or design Ezr. ii. got erroneously into its pre-

¹ Ezr. v. 14, viii. 14, 36, ix. 7 ; Neh. ii. 9, iii. 7 ; Esth. viii. 9, ix. 3.

sent position, and that the first verse of ch. viii. has been corrupted in consequence.

The consideration of Ezr. iv. 6-23 is reserved to the next number.

ARTHUR C. BATH. & WELL.

HEBREWS VI. 4-6.

II.

“For as touching those who were once enlightened and tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and tasted the good Word of God and the powers of the age to come, and then fell away, it is impossible to renew them again unto repentance, seeing they crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh, and put Him to an open shame.”

IN a previous paper on the above passage it was our aim to establish three propositions: (1) That the picture contained in it is not an imaginary one, but that it sets before us what had been the actual condition of the Hebrew Christians addressed. If it be not so, it is difficult to see how the argument of the sacred writer is to attain its end. His reasoning might have been at once met with the reply, “We have not yet reached that stage of Christian life and experience which you have just described; and, although therefore those who have reached it and have fallen away from it may be chargeable with the terrible sin of which you speak, may crucify the Son of God afresh, and may put Him to an open shame, no such sin can at least as yet lie at our door. Your warning does not apply to us. (2) Attention was called to the special nature of the sacred writer’s appeal. It is an exhortation to advance, to hasten forward in the Divine life, to be ashamed, not of apostacy, but of a wilful neglect of great principles to which the Hebrew Christians had given their adhesion, but which they were not carrying out to their legitimate result.

(3) We had to speak of the participles in the sixth verse, and to show that they indicate, not a sin which, once for all completed, had drawn down the just judgment of God, making future repentance impossible, but a continuance in sinning. The language of the writer is not that they *had crucified* the Son of God afresh and put Him to an open shame, and that therefore an irrevocable decree of doom had gone forth against them, but that they were continuing to do so, and that thus they could not comply with what was required of them, "the while" they persisted in repeating "for themselves" the sin of their fathers,—crucifying and holding up to scorn the "Son of God." We have still, before turning to the general meaning of the passage to make one or two observations on words or phrases in it which must be taken into account.

(4) ἀνακαινίζειν εἰς μετάνοιαν. Is it perfectly certain, we may ask, that the μετάνοια now alluded to is thought of as operating in the same field, as concerned with precisely the same objects, as μετάνοια of verse 1? That genuine repentance is always formally the same is no doubt true. It is a change of mind, a different attitude of soul alike towards that which we forsake and that to which we turn. But the contents of the μετάνοια may be different; and it seems not unlikely that that is the case here. In verse 1 it is a repentance "from dead works,"—from a state of life which was not real life, which was separated from God, and the actions of which therefore could only, like all death, be spoken of as making the doer of them unclean both in his own eyes, when he awakened to a sense of religion, and in the eyes of God. In verse 6 the reference is wholly different. The repentance there can be no other than [repentance from that sin of neglecting and substantially rejecting the Son of God of which the Hebrew Christians were guilty. It is true that the word πάλιν is used, but that word belongs closely to ἀνακαινίζειν, and connects itself with the

thought, not of a second repentance from dead works but with a second renewal, which indeed starts with repentance, but that a repentance of the particular nature just alluded to. It does not therefore follow that the persons of whom it is said that they could not be renewed to this repentance, were apostates who had fallen back to a state worse than that in which they had been before they first believed. The renewal to repentance, which they could not find because they were continuing in the sin of which they were guilty, may have been of a different kind.

This conclusion is strengthened when we turn to the word *ἀδύνατον*. That word can only mean "impossible"; and, that it cannot be resolved into "very difficult" is so generally admitted that nothing further need be said upon the point. But where does the impossibility lie? Is it, as many think, in the human agency alone? The answer can only be No. This weakness always belongs to human agency. "God," not man, "worketh in us both to will and to do" (Phil. ii. 13). The nerve of the passage too is destroyed by such an interpretation. Yet how can it be said to be impossible to God, when our Lord Himself says in a passage, the context of which has some leading points of resemblance to the context of this passage, "With men it is impossible, but not with God: for all things are possible with God" (Mark x. 27)? The only answer given is that God's *decree* does not permit repentance in the case supposed. There is, however, no word of Divine decrees in the passage. There is only moral action on the part of God commending itself to the conscience upon moral grounds. One supposition alone brings the impossibility within this field,—that the sin condemned is continuously committed. They who persist in crucifying the Son of God cannot, in the nature of things, be renewed to the higher life to which there is no admission except by faith in the Son of God. God cannot lie. He cannot deny

Himself. He cannot reverse a divine order which is the expression of His own perfection.

Finally, the illustration by which the teaching of our passage is enforced may be noticed for a moment, especially that part contained in verse 8. When it is there said, "If it beareth briars and thorns," the meaning surely is, "if it continues" to do this. The land is not rejected and nigh unto a curse simply because it has borne these weeds, but because it persists in bearing them (again a parallel to the continuous sense of the present participles in verse 6). Let it be improved, let it be wrought and softened till it drink in the rain that cometh oft upon it; let it bring forth herbs meet for them by whom it is tilled, and it will receive a blessing from God. Its condition is not hopeless.¹

We have now examined at some length the leading particulars of this interesting and important passage. It remains for us to devote a little space to its teaching as a whole, and to inquire as to the class of persons who have most need to take it home to themselves. In doing this it is quite impossible to discuss the various opinions which have been entertained regarding it, or the various controversies to which it has given rise. Our object is only to look at the view generally entertained regarding it,—that it teaches the impossibility of a recovery from apostacy, and to suggest for the consideration of our readers whether there is not another view of the words exegetically correct, having a far larger width of application to the Christian Church, and, we venture to think, greatly more solemn in its warnings.

¹ The view now taken of the second part of the illustration is greatly confirmed if we adopt the idea, lying, it may almost be said, in the very structure of the Greek, of Dr. Bruce (in *EXPOSITIO*, third series, vol. ix. p. 431) and also Weiss (*in loc.*), that the land now spoken of is "the same land" as before, not barren rock or hopeless sand. Note the abruptness on any other supposition of the first clause of ver. 8, *ἐκφέρουσα δὲ*; and observe that what is to be supplied to fill up the sentence is not merely *γῆ* but *γῆ . . . ἑτέραν*. *Ἀδόκιμος* also does not mean "reprobate" or "apostate" (comp. 1 Cor. ix. 27).

Is it apostacy, is it a turning round upon the Redeemer whom we had once loved and honoured, and treating Him with malignity and scorn, that the sacred writer has in view? Not so. He is not speaking to apostates. He is addressing a Christian Church, and professedly Christian men. He is not warning against any complete departure from the faith of Christ, which he supposes already to have taken place. He is warning against pausing in the Christian course, and want of zeal in pressing on to those higher and nobler aspects of the truth as it is in Christ, which he felt so anxious to communicate, but of which, owing to the now sluggish and low state of these Hebrew Christians, he feared that it would be vain to speak. At this point, the importance of the words in verse 6, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, appears, and a consideration of them for a moment may help us to see more clearly both what these higher and nobler aspects of the truth are, and how firmly our passage, instead of being a digression, is welded into the main contents of the Epistle. As commonly understood, these words are supposed simply to bring out the heinousness of the sin referred to (Davidson, Weiss, etc.). If it was a sin to crucify and scorn the Son of man, is it not a greater and more dreadful sin to crucify the Son of God? That this effect is gained by them it would be foolish to deny: yet we cannot resist the conviction that the chief reason why they are used lies far deeper. The references either to the "Son," or to "the Son of God," in the Epistle are frequent, and it will, we believe, be found in every instance in which the expression is used that it is the object of the writer not merely to bring out the dignity of the Redeemer in Himself, but to set Him before us as the Divine and Heavenly Redeemer in whom the New Testament dispensation is summed up, in contrast with those lower and more earthly forms in which God had previously manifested His grace to man. Thus Christ is spoken of as the Son in contrast with the prophets

by whom the will of God had been formerly revealed (i. 2) ; with the angels through whom the Old Testament Dispensation had been introduced (i. 13) ; with Moses who had been no more than a servant *in* God's house, while Christ was a Son *over* that house, whose house we are (iii. 6) ; with the High Priest who passed only through the outer apartment of the earthly tabernacle into the inner sanctuary, while our High Priest passes through the heavens to the very throne of God (iv. 14, v. 5) ; with Melchizedek, the greatness of whose heavenly priesthood was no more than a shadow of Christ's heavenly priesthood (vii. 3) ; with the sacrifices of the Law, which could give no more than an outward cleansing, instead of a true and spiritual consecration to the service of God (x. 29). In all these cases it is not the glory of the Son of God only in relation to the Father that is thought of ; it is His glory as the Centre of the new Dispensation, as the Bringer in of its heavenly life, and as the Fulfiller for His people of its heavenly promises. Thus then also here. When the sacred writer speaks of "the Son of God," the sin of crucifying Him is aggravated by the thought that by such an act the deepest and most essential characteristic of the Gospel age, of "the world to come," is extinguished, and that they who thus extinguish it are thereby forfeiting the very character and privileges which "the Son of God," not merely "the Son of man," died, and now lives to secure for them. Hence also the *ἐαυτοῦς*, a word which has occasioned no small measure of perplexity to commentators. Men could not really crucify the Son of God afresh, but they could reject Him in His heavenly character, and treat Him as if He were a mere pretender. And this is in conformity with the teaching of the whole Epistle, the most special aim of which is to lead us onward to a heavenly condition, instead of that condition "of this world" (ix. 1) in which all former revelations leave us.

If, accordingly, we ask, What class of persons in our Christian communities do the Hebrew Christians here reprimanded bring before us? the answer ought not to be difficult. They represent not what we understand by apostates, but that large body of professing Christians who have accepted not a few of the fundamental truths of the Gospel, and have experienced no small measure of its power; but they have come to a pause. They have no quarrel with the foundation principles of the Christian faith, or, as it ought rather to be expressed, with the principles enforced by it at the beginning of the Christian course. They own its great doctrines of repentance from dead works and of faith towards God, of baptism and the laying on of hands, of the resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment. They have tasted many of its privileges, and to some extent lived under the energies of the new life imparted by it. They have learned something of that blessed peace which flows from believing in Jesus; and, in looking either at the present or the past, they are able to fix upon many happy hours when they feel, or when they felt that, resting upon the Rock of Ages, they had made over to them the promise of the heavenly inheritance. But they will go no further. Satisfied with what has been done for them, they seek no more. In the hope that they have been delivered from the sentence of death, and that they have in some degree, however small, had the Divine life implanted in them, they have done. Into the full extent of that love of God, of which St. Paul declared, even while he prays that we may be filled with it, that it has a height, and a depth, and a length, and a breadth which pass our knowledge, they will penetrate no further. To the heights of that glory to which they might be brought, they will make no effort to ascend. With the boundless treasures that are before them, they do not care to be enriched. Him, "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," they do not care to know. They

have passed, it may be, the boundary line which separates death from life and hell from heaven. They are out of the wilderness, they are delivered from its trials, and there, therefore, they will rest from their labours. Why cross the stream? Why enter upon new conflicts? Surely it were better to pitch their tents even on this side of Jordan, and to exclaim, "Return unto thy rest, O my soul." That is the spiritual condition to which the text is spoken, and it need not be said that it is something far wider, more general, more common than apostacy.

It may, indeed, be objected that the language of our passage, "crucifying the Son of God afresh and putting Him to an open shame," is much too strong for the sin now described. Let us look at the objection for a moment.

(1) May those who only refuse the higher lessons of the Christian faith, and who, with more or less consciousness of what they are doing, deliberately decline to make further progress, be justly said "to crucify for themselves the Son of God afresh?" Were Christianity no more than a doctrine, or a set of doctrines, it might not be possible to say so. But it is far more than a doctrine; it is the life of the Son of God in the soul of man. It is the life of One who was not merely a human teacher, however exalted, or a human example, however beautiful. It is the life of the Son of God become our life, of Him who came down from heaven to earth that we might behold in Him the perfect representation of the Father's life,—of Him who, amidst all His lowliness and humiliation and sufferings, was God manifest in the flesh, and who now lives, "holy, harmless, undefiled, separated from sinners, and made higher than the heavens" (vii. 26). To have this Christ formed in the soul is the meaning of the Christian faith; according to the language of St. Paul, "I am crucified with Christ, nevertheless I live . . . by the faith (not of the Son of man, but) of

the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself for me." The Son of God, God Himself, in us! What a thought is that! God in at least all the perfection of His moral attributes, the sum of all that is most true and beautiful and good. Is this Christ to be in us as our new life, where is the limit to growth? where the point at which men can cry, It is enough? Nay, is not language of that kind rather a crucifying of the Son of God afresh? We said that we believed in Him, that we took Him to be our life; and now it turns out that He whom we accepted is not the Christ at all. He is a Christ of our own making, a Christ imperfect instead of perfect, limited instead of illimitable, restrained by the weaknesses of earth instead of being higher than the heavens. Thus practically to deny Him is surely to crucify Him for ourselves afresh. And then, may it not be said that,—

(2) As regards others, it is to "put Him to an open shame." If it be the first duty of a Christian man to see that the Son of God live within him, it is his second duty to see that by the life so lived he commend his Lord to others. Not by words and arguments, not by reasonings and entreaties only, are Christian men to win the world to the feet of that Redeemer who is yet to reign gloriously over it. These things are, in their own place, both good and necessary; but there is something better fitted to attain the end,—that the world shall see in the lives of Christians an amount of super-earthly life to be seen nowhere else, and a constant straining after a still higher perfection than has yet been reached. Words can be met with words, and arguments with arguments; reasonings can be answered with reasonings, and the heart can be steeled against entreaties; but there is a power which enters where nothing else can enter, which enters calmly, silently, irresistibly into the souls of others, making men wish that they themselves experienced it, and that is the power of a heavenly

life having its answer in the soul. Are there not moments in the life of almost every one when,—

“Though inland far we be,
Our souls have sight of that immortal sea
Which brought us hither”?

and never do these moments so readily come to us as when we behold, not great deeds of benevolence or martyr deaths, but the devout, gentle, loving spirit speaking of “Heaven which is our home.” He whose sullenness of disposition a thousand sermons will not break will not unfrequently yield to a touch, a voice, a tear, which tell him, not so much to be good on this earth, as that there must be somewhere a land of perfect tenderness and purity and peace. Whereas, on the other hand, do we not witness every day the disastrous effects upon the world of the worldly lives of professing Christians? Look at them, the world cries. They say that they are of heaven, and yet they are as earthly as ourselves, as hard, as uncharitable, as unloving, as greedy of gain, as censorious, as prone to speak evil of their brethren; we see nothing to attract us there. God is merciful, His judgment will be right, and we shall wait for it. It is a mistake to think that the depraved and the criminal around us are not saved to Christ, because we have too few ministers and missionaries. More than to anything else the failure is to be traced to the shortcomings and sins of those who call themselves followers of a Heavenly Lord. By not pressing onwards to His perfection they put Him, the Son of God, to an open shame.

So important is the subject with which we have been dealing, that we may be allowed a closing word on the use to be made of it in the pulpit. Every minister knows that he has in his congregation members of the class of which we have been speaking, and which, as we contend, the writer of the Epistle has in view. These persons are not apostates. They admit that the beginnings of Christianity

are good. They only urge that its deeper and higher lessons are beyond their reach. Why interfere, they say, with our business in the world? with the ordinary arrangements of society, or with common pleasures? It is good to hear of Him who loved us and gave Himself for us, to listen to His call, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest"; to be assured of His pardoning mercy; and to be told that He "hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light." But why not be content with this? Why not be satisfied with that simple Gospel which has stilled so many pangs of conscience, wiped away so many tears, and shed its rays of heavenly light around so many death-beds? Men are often known to speak, they are still more frequently known to think thus. What is a minister to do? Can he do else than tell such persons that the lessons they profess to value are not all, that they are not even the highest lessons to be taught to the followers of Christ? that, if men rest in them, there is no small danger that they may be doing so because they hope thus to gain both this world and the next; because they think that they may thus serve two masters, and may escape the self-reproaches, the self-denials, the humiliations, and the crosses which we naturally shun? Ought he not to say that the Christianity thus cultivated is far from being the complete Christianity of the New Testament; that it is not the full obedience and submission to our Lord and Master that are required of us; that it is rather, in the secret of our hearts, to crucify for ourselves the Son of God afresh; that it is, in our lives, as these are read by others, to put Him to an open shame?

WM. MILLIGAN,

“THE ARAMAIC GOSPEL.”

II.

AFTER thus disposing of *θέλοντα*, Prof. Marshall goes on to account for the divergence between *αἴρωντος* and *δανείσασθαι*. The common Aramaic root, he suggests, is רשא. An examination of the usage of the word shows conclusively that it can represent neither *δανείζομαι* nor *αἴρω*. Prof. Marshall's account of the word is gravely inaccurate. The facts as stated by Levy are these. The primary idea involved in רשא is that of “possessing authority, might, power.” When followed by ב, it signifies to “have power over some one,” and is especially used of the power of a creditor over a debtor. Hence it means “to lend.” Examples are—

Deut. xv. 2 (Onq.): כָּל גֹּבֵר מְרִי רְשׁוֹ דִּירְשִׁי בְּחִבְרִיהּ.

“Every creditor who shall lend to his neighbour.”

Deut. xxiv. 11 (Onq.): וְנִבְרָא דְאֵת רְשִׁי בֵּיהּ.

“The man to whom thou dost lend.”

“A borrower” may be expressed paraphrastically by מן דרשן ביה, “he to whom men lend”: but this is no proof at all that רשי means “to borrow.” The ordinary Aramaic words to express the latter notion are זוף or זוף and שאל. And accordingly the phrase in St. Matthew is rendered in the Peshitto by $\text{ܣܠܐ ܕܥܠܝܢܝܢ ܕܥܠܝܢܝܢ}$. It will follow from this that if we refuse to admit that רשא can mean “to borrow,” the extension of this idea, which Prof. Marshall would read into the word, of “forceful seizure of goods” will be still less authorized.

In the last line of the passages under consideration we have the variant rendering *μη ἀποστραφῆς* and *μη ἀπαίτει*. This is accounted for by the difference between the Peal and Aphel of the verb הדר. “The Peal,” says Prof. Marshall, means “to turn back, turn round, turn away.”

We fail to find any instances of the use of the word in this last meaning. In point of fact it is opposed both to the "*usus loquendi*" and to the root idea of the verb, which is that of "returning," "turning back," either physically to a place from which one had originally set out, or metaphorically to a moral position from which one had fallen. "The Aphel," continues Prof. Marshall, means "to bring back, fetch back, ask back, answer." Here again we feel bound to protest against the use of the word as an equivalent of ἀπαίτει. It is difficult to find satisfactory examples of הָרַר in the sense "ask back," and in any case it is a meaning but rarely found. It seems never to have this signification in the Targums.

"The verb הָרַר," continues Prof. Marshall, "in the Aphel and Pael regularly means 'to answer' in rabbinic literature." And so he goes on to equate ἀποκριθεὶς (St. Matt. xi. 25) with ἡγαλλιάσατο τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἀγίῳ (St. Luke x. 21). It is doubtful whether the use of הָרַר = to answer, is sufficiently authenticated to authorise its use here. But even if we admit this, surely the verb הָרַר followed by the Aramaic equivalent of τῷ Πνεύματι τῷ Ἀγίῳ could only suggest the rendering "gave glory to the Holy Spirit," a meaning which the Greek words certainly do not even hint at.

Two passages in the May number of THE EXPOSITOR further illustrate the untrustworthiness of Prof. Marshall's method of working. The first deals with the variants ὑψηλὸν (St. Matt. xvii. 1 ; St. Mark ix. 2) and προσεύξασθαι (St. Luke ix. 28). The latter word suggests the Aramaic equivalent הַלְאָה. But how can this be reconciled with ὑψηλόν? Prof. Marshall thinks that if for הַלְאָה were read, the difficulty would be solved, although he acknowledges that רַם not הַלְאָה would be the word that we should expect. When we examine the use of הַלְאָה in the Targums we find that it corresponds to the Hebrew עָלִיּוֹן. Now

the point to be noticed about both these words is that they denote not simply "high," but "higher" or "highest." The object or objects of contrast are either expressed or implied by the context. Thus ܘܢܘܠܘܢ in the Targums is applied to the "upper waters" Gen. i. 6 (J.I.), but more frequently it is applied either to God Himself, or to the dwelling place of God in the heavens, conceived of as a chamber (Job xxxvii. 9), or lastly to the angels of God (Job xv. 15). Hence a consideration of the use of the word in Aramaic justifies us in refusing to admit the possibility of its being employed as the equivalent of ὑψηλὸς in St. Matthew. If so applied, we could only think of the mountains as being termed "higher" in contrast to some unmentioned mountain, or else as being in some special sense conceived of as the dwelling place of God.

In the second of the two instances alluded to, Prof. Marshall is dealing with the variants ἐξέρχεται (St. Matt. xxiv. 27) and ἀστράπτουσα (St. Luke xvii. 24). "The Aramaic equivalent," we are told, "of ἐξέρχεται is ܘܢܘܠܘܢ, which occurs twice in Biblical Aramaic (Dan. ii. 5, 8). 'The word has gone forth from me.' The verb used of the flashing forth of light is ܘܢܘܠܘܢ." The first of these statements is entirely misleading. It seems to imply that ܘܢܘܠܘܢ is the ordinary and common Aramaic word meaning "to go out," and occurs amongst other examples in Daniel. The exact contrary of this is the fact. ܘܢܘܠܘܢ in Daniel is a difficult and uncertain word. It has been suggested that it comes from a root ܘܢܘܠܘܢ equivalent to ܘܢܘܠܘܢ, but this rendering is now almost universally rejected. Most modern philologists have adopted the view of Prof. Nöldeke¹ that the word is the Persian *azda*, "certain."² Whilst however

¹ In Schrader, *Cuneiform Inscript.*, p. 617.

² So Kautzsch (*Gram. des Bibl. Aram.*, p. 63), Prof. Driver (*Introd. to Lit. of O.T.*, p. 469), Mühlau and Volek (in *Ges. Handwörterbuch*, ed. 10 and 11), and the two latest commentators on Daniel, Meinhold and Bevan.

Prof. Marshall's authorities for his use of the word are thus shown to be valueless, there is a word, אוד, which is used in Rabbinic literature in a sense approximating to that of ἐξέρχασθαι. Jastrow gives the renderings “to be cut off, go apart, be gone.” Levy translates by “*gehen, weggehen*,” and cites the following instances:—

Schab 34^b: אודו לטעמייהו. “They differ, each following his own opinions.”

Ned 41^a: שיתא אודו. “Six (halakhoth) escaped his memory.”

Meil 17^b; נפק אודא. “He went out and disappeared.”

That the word, however, is a genuine Aramaic root, and not merely based upon a misunderstanding of the passage in Daniel, is very dubious. Even if it were, it would be quite unsuited to express the meaning involved in ἐξέρχασθαι in the verse of St. Matthew in question.

An illustration in THE EXPOSITOR for June deals with the following passages:—

ST. MATT. XVIII. 15.

Κύριε
ἐλεήσόν
μου τὸν υἱόν

ST. MARK IX. 17.

Διδάσκαλε
ἤμεγα
τὸν υἱόν μου

ST. LUKE IX. 38.

Διδάσκαλε
δέομαί σου ἐπιβλέψαι
ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.

Prof. Marshall attempts to reconcile the verbs in the second line by reference to a common original בְּכַטִּי. “This word,” he continues, “found only in the Targum of Jonathan¹ is apparently precisely the equivalent of בְּבַעִית.” We have noticed בְּכַטִּי also in the Aramaic text of Tobit, edited by Dr. Neubauer (chap. x.). “I have failed,” says Prof. Marshall, “to find an instance, in which בְּכַטִּי is followed by an accusative, as בְּבַעִי is; but this is doubtless due to the scantiness of our literature. I suggest then that the common text, of which Matthew and Luke gave a free

¹ Should not “Jerus. Targums” be read here for “Targum of Jonathan”?

translation, was בְּכַמְטוֹת בְּרִי, O my son! I pray for my son!"

We wish that Prof. Marshall had given some examples of בבעו "followed by an accusative." Such a construction would be impossible. If בכמטו is not found in this collocation, it is certainly not due to "the scantiness of our literature," but to the fact that such a construction would be anomalous and ungrammatical. The facts about בבעו are these. It is properly a noun meaning "prayer," or "entreaty," and occurs for instance in—

Jer. vii. 16: בבעו וצלו, "With supplication and prayer."

1 Kings viii. 39: תעביד בעורתהון, "Thou wilt accomplish their prayer."

It is found also with a following genitive, but it should be noticed, that this seems to be always subjective, not objective. Thus בעות עבדך (2 Sam. vii. 20) means "the prayer which thy servant makes." בעותא דמשה (Exod. viii. 27, J.I.) is "the prayer uttered by Moses." More commonly, however, ב is prefixed. Two constructions are then found. The person supplicated follows in the vocative case or with כן prefixed. The use of כמטו is very similar. It occurs, *e.g.*, as a substantive in the accusative in Exodus xi. 8, J. יבעון כמטו מיני; with ב prefixed, followed by a vocative in Genesis xliv. 18, במטו ריבוני, and followed by כן in Tobit x. מינך, "I pray thee." It is more than doubtful whether במטות ברי could possibly have the meaning, "I pray for my son." The only probable and natural sense would be "with prayer of (to) my son," *i.e.*, "O my son, I pray thee . . ."

In the verse following that just discussed we find the variants—

ST. MATT. XVII. 16.
προσιήεγκα

ST. MARK IX. 18.
εἶπα

ST. LUKE IX. 40.
εἰδείθην

Following in the track of a suggestion made by Buxtorf as

to the *etymology* of כִּטַּו, Prof. Marshall proceeds to make a quite groundless conjecture as to its *actual use*. "If כִּטַּו," he says, "possessed the meaning of 'beseeching,' it would be precisely after the analogy of the Greek word ἐντυγγάω. That it did possess this force is, we think, rendered clear from a passage (viz. St. Luke ix. 40) in the narrative under discussion." It is not difficult to see the logical inaccuracy involved in these words. They present us with an example of argument in a circle. That כִּטַּו meant "to beseech" would be clear, if the assumption of its possession of this meaning were the only one possible method of accounting for the difference between the three Greek words given above. But this is just the point which has to be proved. "Will it need," Prof. Marshall gravely asks, "any persuasion to convince my readers that we have here respectively—

אִמְרִית, אִמְרִית, כִּטַּו?"

Certainly we think that very much persuasion will be needed to convince even the most credulous, unless some sort of proof takes the place of mere assumption. So far from denoting "beseeching," כִּטַּו can mean nothing but "reach to," "arrive at," "happen," as *e.g.* in—

Job xx. 6: וְרִשְׁיָהּ לְעַנְנֵי יַמֵּי, "And his head reach to the clouds."

Zech. xiv. 5: אֲרֵי יַמֵּי הַיַּלָּה דְּטוּרֵיָא לְאַזֵּל, "For the valley of the mountains shall reach unto Azel."

Gen. xliii. 20, J.I.: כִּד כִּטַּוֵּנָא, "When we arrived."

Surely such arbitrary conjectures are a serious blemish in a series of articles, which aim at being a scientific exposition of an, as yet, unproved theory. To quote words used in another connection by Prof. Marshall himself, "they do but injure the cause they are intended to serve."

We think that sufficient proof of the linguistic improbability of the majority of Prof. Marshall's reconstructions

has now been given, and that from his four remaining articles it will suffice if we take single illustrations.

In the article for September, Prof. Marshall compares the variants—

ST. MATT. IX. 11.
ὁ διδάσκαλος ὑμῶν

ST. MARK II. 16.
πίει

ST. LUKE V. 30.
πίνετε

διδάσκαλος might be a rendering of רבכון. For *πίνετε* he suggests רביתון, רב ב being written for ו, as in the Samaritan Targum. There is no intrinsic improbability in the use of the word itself. The objection to it is that it is quite unlikely that St. Mark or St. Luke would have failed to see the sarcasm involved in it (for it means of course "be drunken"), and have given such a feeble equivalent as the Greek *πίνω*.

Our example from THE EXPOSITOR for November, is the following:—

ST. MARK V. 41.
κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς
τοῦ παιδίου

ST. LUKE VIII. 54.
κρατήσας τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῆς
ἐφόνησε

The second line seems to Prof. Marshall to give "clear evidence of an Aramaic original." "The regular word for 'child' is רבִּי; but the verb which means 'to call by name' is רבִּי." The point here is that רבִּי in this sense is always followed in the Targums by שמה or בשמה. This is the key-note of the phrase. The verb means literally "to make great." It is used in—

Jer. xi. 16 : כן רבי " שמיך בעממיא. "The Lord hath made great thy name among the nations."

Exod. xxxi. 2 (Onq.): רביתי בשום. "I have made great by name, *i.e.*, I have specially marked out, Bezaleel."

Jer. xx. 3 : לא פשחור רבי " שמך. "Id est, (non) Paschuris magno nomine vocavit."—*Buxt.*

These examples will show with how little probability the

word can be assumed to be the equivalent of ἐφώνησε. To express the idea of "calling by name," Aramaic, like Hebrew, uses קָרָא.

The December number of THE EXPOSITOR furnishes us with the following example:—

ST. MATT. XIII. 19.
τὸ ἐσπαρμένον

ST. MARK IV. 15.
τὸν λόγον
τὸν ἐσπαρμένον

ST. LUKE VIII. 12.
τὸν λόγον

λόγον might be a rendering of דְּבוּרָא. A slight change would give us דְּרָרָא, which Prof. Marshall renders "that which is sown." It is important here to notice that the "word" represents the "seed" of the Parable (ὁ σπόρος ἐστὶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ, St. Luke viii. 11), and the idea involved in the words is that of the sowing of seed. Now this is not the meaning of the verb דָּרָא, which corresponds to the Heb. זָרָא, not זָרַע, and means (1) to strew, scatter (Exod. xxxii. 20, Onq., Isa. xli. 16), (2) to winnow (Jer. iv. 11). It seems never to be used of seed in the Targums, and it is unlikely therefore that it would have been employed in this sense in the Logia. The common Aramaic word for "to sow" is זָרַע, "sown" therefore would be זָרִיעַ.

It will be well now to sum up, as briefly as is consistent with clearness, those defects and blemishes which as it seems to us make the majority of Prof. Marshall's indications of translation untenable. We shall consider them first from the standpoint of language. Here we shall be concerned mainly with the linguistic probability of Prof. Marshall's reconstructions of the original Aramaic Document. And secondly, we shall deal more particularly with the phenomena presented by the Synoptic Gospels. In this case we shall have to consider the probability or improbability of such an original Aramaic document being embedded in the strata of our gospels.

We are not here concerned to discuss the difficult question

of the original language of the Logia mentioned by Papias. Prof. Marshall, with most modern critics, assumes that they were written in Aramaic. But even when this has been postulated much remains to be defined. The extant Aramaic literature, as distinct from the Syriac dialects, comprises, roughly speaking, the following branches: ¹—

I. The Aramaic portions of Ezra, dating probably from the fifth century B.C.

II. The Aramaic of Daniel, which is now generally dated about 166 B.C.

III. The dialects ² of the Targums, the earliest of which in their present form cannot be earlier than the end of the second century A.D., and which are probably (the Palestinian certainly) later.³

IV. The Aramaic of the Talmuds.

V. The Aramaic of the inscriptions, comprising (principally):

1. The Nabathean dialect.
2. The Palmyrene.
3. The Egyptian Aramaic.

Since these remains cover a period extending from the fifth century B.C. to the third or fourth century A.D., we naturally ask ourselves whether we cannot define more closely the term "Aramaic," as applied to a document which must fall within the limits of the first century of our era. Prof. Marshall very rightly attempts to do this. He started, he tells us, with "the surmise, which gradually deepened into a fixed conviction that the Urevangelium was written in the language of the Jewish Targums—not, however, without sundry dialectical peculiarities found in the Samaritan Targum."⁴ This statement calls for careful

¹ Dr. Wright's *Comp. Gram. of the Sem. Languages*, p. 16.

² Slightly differing, especially in vocabulary.

³ Nöldeke, *Encycl. Brit.*, "Semitic Languages," 648^b.

⁴ *Expositor*, February, 1891, p. 110.

examination. The so-called "Jewish Targums" fall into two classes, the Palestinian and the Babylonian. It would seem that the Babylonian Jews, instead of producing an independent translation, borrowed the Palestinian Targums and revised them to suit their own needs. Hence we find that the language of the Babylonian translations whilst being in the main Palestino-Aramaic, has a distinct East-Aramaic element. And further, when we confine our attention to the Babylonian Targums, we find individualities of style and diction. Onqelos uses phrases which are never found in Jonathan, and the latter has peculiarities which distinguish his translation from that of Onqelos.¹ Such individualities, employed by Prof. Marshall in his retranslations, are the following:—

כָּלִי, "to cry out," though used by Jonathan never occurs in Onqelos.

כֵּן אִוְלֵא is a characteristic of Jonathan, never in Onqelos.

אֲרִי, "but," is peculiar to the Babylonian Targums; the Jerusalem Targums prefer אַרְוִים.

בְּבֵי is also a characteristic of the Babylonian Targums; the Jerusalem Targums used instead בְּמִטֵּי.

It is surely a defect in Prof. Marshall's method that he should have thus combined in his supposed Aramaic Logia the peculiarities of idiom that distinguish different dialects and individual writers. With regard to the Samaritan Targum little can here be said. But the suggestion that "If the Logia and the Samaritan Targum were written in the same half-century, they present us the Aramaic language at the same stage of literary development" is purely hypothetical, and has no evidence to support it. But still further: in spite of his conviction that the Logia were written in the language of the Jewish Targums, coloured

¹ Frankel, *Zu dem Targum der Propheten*, p. 14.

with some of the peculiarities of the Samaritan Targum, Prof. Marshall is led by the exigencies of his theory to overstep the limits thus laid down. With a courageous indifference to considerations of period and dialect he scours almost the entire range of Aramaic literature in his search for linguistic curiosities. The Aramaic of Daniel, the Palestinian and Babylonian Targums, the Aramaic of the Talmuds, and even Neo-Hebrew, all alike furnish material for the reconstruction of the Logia. We collect here some of the rare and doubtful words, or words used in a doubtful and improbable meaning, which are thought worthy of a place in Prof. Marshall's document.

March, 1891.	דרך	implying simply "the coming" of birds.
	שרף	= <i>ικμάδα</i> .
	מותר	= <i>βίος</i> and <i>τὰ λοιπά</i> .
	פרך	= <i>ξηραίνεται</i> .
	בענין	= <i>μόγισ</i> .
	דקק	= <i>ρήγγυμι</i> .
	חסיל	= <i>τέλειος</i> and <i>οικτίρμων</i> .
	חזורה	= <i>περιχώρου</i> .
	שירא	= <i>πλήθος</i> .
	ארבעה	= <i>κλίνη</i> .
	גב	= <i>ὑπό</i> and <i>ἐπί</i> .
	נטלטל	= <i>βεβλημένον</i> and <i>αιρόμενον</i> .
	סלק	= <i>ἀπεστέγασαν</i> .
	נטללא	= <i>δῶμα</i> .
	טללא	= <i>στέγην</i> .
	פחרין	= <i>κεράμων</i> .
	ערק	in the simple sense of "depar- ture."
	בגו	= <i>ὄπου ἦν</i> .
	בגו	= <i>διά</i> .
	בריא	= <i>ὀρίων</i> .

April, 1891.	שנר	= ἀπολέσαι.
	רשא	= δανείζομαι and αἶρω.
	הדר	= ἀποστραφῆς and ἀπαίτει.
	שרא	= καθήμενοι (prop. "to encamp").
May, 1891.	אוד	= ἐξέρχασθαι.
	עלאה	= ὑψηλός, and applied to ὄρος.
June, 1891.	כטא	= ἐδεήθην.
	אתכטי	= ἐξελθόντες, without object expressed.
	אזא	= ἄψας, applied to a lamp.
	בכמות ברי	= δέομαί σου . . . ἐπὶ τὸν υἱόν μου.
Sept., 1891.	בהדרא	= ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό.
	רוי	= πίνει.
	אתהוי	= γέγονεν (but first quoted from the philosophical Hebrew of the 13th cent.).
Nov., 1891.	רבי	= ἐφώνησε (without שומא or בשמא).
	(ברא ארעא)	= "(lower) region" (for ἄβυσσος), properly "open field" or "country."
	אלא	(without a negative preceding) = "only."
Dec., 1891.	דרא	= ἐσπαρμένον.
Aug., 1892.	רדידא	= fine raiment in general.
	תרעייא	in an active sense "inroads," "ravages,"

a list which, if space permitted, we might readily increase.

If then the few fragments retranslated by Prof. Marshall contain so much that is unique in the language, what startling phenomena must the entire document have presented! To understand the dialect in which it was written we should have to request its discoverer to furnish us with a careful glossary, and a revised Aramaic Grammar. It may of course be said that Aramaic dialects differ so much that we cannot feel sure that one containing such a mix-

ture could not have existed. This is perhaps true; but we can at least assert with great confidence, that this particular dialect has not a shred of evidence to support it, that it is a purely conjectural one, that it was certainly never spoken by any people known to history, and finally that quite as certainly it was never committed to writing until late in this 19th century.

We turn now to our second consideration. Are the features presented by the Synoptic Gospels consistent with the theory that in certain sections they are translations from a genuine Apostolic Document like the Logia of St. Matthew? In examining the examples given by Prof. Marshall we have been strongly impressed by the very wide divergencies between the accounts of our Canonical Gospels. An example will illustrate this. The narrative of the woman with the issue of blood is common to all three Gospels. In St. Mark it occupies 10 verses, in St. Luke 6, and in St. Matthew 3; or to state the case somewhat differently, St. Mark employs some 154 words, St. Luke 104, and St. Matthew only 47.¹ St. Matthew omits the statement that the woman had spent much money on physicians and had heard of the fame of Jesus. He omits also the entire section which narrates the perception of Jesus that power had gone forth from Him, His question to the crowd and the consequent confession of the woman. St. Luke, who in the main retains this section, omits the statement that the woman came impelled by the reputation of Jesus. According to the best authorities, he omits also the allusion to her experiences with the doctors. He leaves out the account of her deliberation previous to her act of faith, and the assertion that "she perceived in her body that she was healed." He omits also the statement that Jesus looked round to see who had touched Him. And finally

¹ We have used the text given in Rushbrooke's *Synopticon*.

St. Mark omits the statement of St. Luke that, in reply to the question of Jesus, all denied having touched Him. To what does such wide divergence and such difference of treatment point. Surely not to the conclusion that our Canonical Evangelists were translating from St. Matthew's Logia. How could they, who could not even claim to be eyewitnesses of the facts recorded, have so ventured to mutilate the work of an Apostle? To this argument an objection will perhaps be raised on the ground of acknowledged fact. "Modern critics," it may be said, "are almost unanimous in asserting, that at least two of our Evangelists did as a matter of fact use the Logia in the compilation of their Gospels. It matters little from this point of view whether they used the Aramaic original or a Greek translation. The argument from their divergence would apply equally to both, and is therefore excluded." But let us reconsider the matter. On Prof. Marshall's hypothesis, our three Evangelists had before them the Aramaic Logia of St. Matthew. How, we repeat, could they have treated it with the freedom implied in their accounts? But now let us suppose the Logia to have been previously translated into Greek, and quite possibly somewhat recast. On the "Two-Document Hypothesis" the compilers of our Canonical St. Matthew and St. Luke employed in the composition of their Gospels two documents, this Greek translation of the Logia and our canonical St. Mark, or a document very similar to it. Surely the fact of previous translation would account largely for the freedom with which the "Logia" was treated. It would tend to obscure the immediate consciousness of the Apostolic origin of the work. And this feeling would be helped by the fact that side by side with it there was being used a second Greek document confessedly not of Apostolic origin. And thus we are led to the conclusion that whilst the divergencies in our Gospels seem inexplicable on the hypothesis that our Evangelists

were translating from the original Aramaic Logia, this difficulty is, if not altogether accounted for, at least greatly lessened, by the theory that they used a Greek translation. *Previous translation explains divergence of account.*

But once again: side by side with divergence of subject matter, our Gospels present us with very frequent coincidence in phraseology. Impressed by this latter phenomenon, Dr. Weiss asserts that "The writing which lies at the basis of our three Gospels cannot have been the primitive Hebrew work of St. Matthew, but an old Greek translation of it." Prof. Marshall, who quotes these words, thinks this "multiplication of documents" unnecessary, and prefers to appeal to oral instruction. "A current Greek rendering of the Aramaic, . . . supplemented from time to time by personal information, amply explains all the phenomena." This statement is misleading. Either such a "current Greek rendering" must have been stereotyped and crystallized into set words and phrases, in which case it would approximate so nearly to Dr. Weiss' "Greek translation" as to be indistinguishable from it, or it would not explain the phenomenon in question—coincidence in the Greek wording of our Gospels. There is one particular case of this verbal coincidence which seems to tell with crushing force against the translation theory. It is the word *ἐπιούσιος* in the Lord's Prayer. We may ask in passing how, if our three Evangelists were translating from a common original, as Prof. Marshall apparently assumes, St. Mark could have omitted this, the pivot and keynote of all Christian worship. But what can we say of *ἐπιούσιος*? What Aramaic equivalent can we suppose to have given rise to this strange and difficult word? Certainly not *מחר*, which Jerome tells us that he found in the Gospel according to the Hebrews. How could St. Matthew and St. Luke, translating independently, have simultaneously hit upon a word so rare that Origen supposes it to have been coined by the Evan-

gelists (Orig. de Orat. 27). And if, baffled in this direction, we fall back upon the theory of "a current (oral) Greek rendering of the Aramaic," we are met again by the objection that if after passing from mouth to mouth such a rendering had settled down into so stereotyped a form, it would differ in a hardly perceptible degree from a written document.

And lastly: some of the variations presented by the synoptists seem capable of explanation on the supposition of corruption in the Greek text itself. Conjectures in this direction may often reach what Dr. Sanday calls "the climax of ingenuity," and seem "almost too brilliant to be true."¹ But surely it seems easier to suppose that such variants as *περὶ τῶν χαίρων* and *τὸ τῆς περιχώρου*² arose from ambiguity in the Greek text than to recognise in *ܢܘܪܐ* their common Aramaic original.

And so we draw to a close. We find that the instances of translation adduced by Prof. Marshall are unsatisfactory. They are based too often upon etymological misconceptions or linguistic impossibilities. He frequently postulates for words senses entirely at variance with the known usage of the language. And here it must be remembered that our knowledge of Aramaic is not fragmentary. The literature is sufficiently extensive to enable us nearly always to affirm with confidence what the linguistic use of a word was in actual fact. Again Prof. Marshall's theory is contradicted in two important particulars by the phenomena presented in the Gospels. On the one hand it altogether fails to account for their coincidence in verbal phraseology. On the other, it intensifies, instead of decreasing, the difficulty already felt in their divergencies in the subject matter of common narratives. It may be that the writers of our canonical St. Matthew and St. Luke made use of the

¹ EXPOSITOR, May, 1891, p. 348.

² EXPOSITOR, March, 1891, p. 213.

Logia: modern critics assert it with increasing unanimity. But if so, they must have had it before them in the form of a Greek translation. At any rate, if they employed and disintegrated the original Aramaic document, we still wait for the scholar who shall re-discover its missing fragments and reset them in their original unity.

WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN.

[Since the preceding article was written, some very pertinent criticisms upon Prof. Marshall's methods have appeared in Dr. Resch's instructive and interesting volume, entitled *Aussercanonische Paralleltexre* (1893), pp. 94-108. Dr. Resch does not however deal with the philological character of Prof. Marshall's results, and his objections are thus independent of those that have been taken above. But he mentions (p. 160) the significant fact that Dr. Dalman, the learned Talmudic scholar, has expressed to him grave doubts respecting the manner in which Prof. Marshall handles his Aramaic.]

BREVIA.

Notes on Gal. v. 8.—That ἡ πεισμονή should mean “this persuasion” (R.V. as well as A.V.) is difficult to believe, even when due weight is allowed to what Bishop Lightfoot calls “a faint reference to the preceding πείθεσθαι” (v. 7). Bengel’s note *ad loc.* is even more than usually suggestive.¹ His feeling is evidently against translating the article as though it were the demonstrative pronoun. This is probably an error inherited from Latin versions, with their “*Persuasio hæc.*” One can understand how blindly the Jesuit compiler, Cornelius à Lapide, who used the Vulgate as his text and the original Greek as his commentary, followed Anselm and the Latin fathers in their conventional exegesis. (See Augustine and Jerome on the passage.)

Nor was it likely that Luther should see with other eyes than those of Augustine. His words here only represent his master’s teaching: “Paulus . . . indicat hanc persuasionem et doctrinam non esse ex Christo, qui vocaverat eos in Gratia, sed ex diabolo.”

The Greek fathers are not unanimous. Chrysostom and Theophylact agree with the Latin rendering, and make ἡ πεισμονή refer to the Judaizing schism in the churches of Galatia against which the Epistle was mainly directed. Origen, however, seems to take a different view (*Contra Celsum*, vi. 57): “Even if the uttering of persuasive arguments comes from God, persuasion at least (*i.e.* the proper result of persuasive and sound arguments) is not of God: as Paul clearly teaches when he says, ἡ πεισμονή κ.τ.λ.”² In other words, Origen regards the term “Persuasion” in this passage as used generically. Parallels to this use of the article may be said to swarm in the Epistles of St. Paul, as Godet has noted *passim* in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans.

Theodoret’s testimony is in support of Origen, and is also independently interesting: ἴδιον θεοῦ τὸ καλεῖν, τὸ δὲ πείθεσθαι τῶν ἀκούοντων. “It belongs to God to call; it is the part of His hearers to obey (be persuaded).” With this comment on the verse his

¹ This is not meant to imply that his reference to Eustathius, the Homeric Grammarian, is more than indirectly useful, as showing the difficulty of understanding ἡ πεισμονή naturally.

² καὶ τὸ πιστικοὺς λέγεσθαι λέγουσ ἀπὸ θεοῦ, τὸ γὰρ πείθεσθαι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀπὸ θεοῦ. σαφῶς ὁ Παῦλος διδάσκει, λέγων ἡ πεισμονή κ.τ.λ.

remarks on another passage (2 Thess. iii. 2: "For all have not faith") are in perfect, and almost verbal, agreement. He confirms his exegesis by references to John vii. 37 and Luke ix. 23, and adds: οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκη βιάζεται, ἀλλὰ τὴν γνώμην ζητεῖ="For (God) does not force (belief) by compulsion, but seeks a voluntary assent."

St. Paul's words convey a general statement, not indeed unconnected with the context, but bearing the same sort of relation to it as that occupied by the proverb quoted in the next verse (*v.* 9). It is the familiar thought of (*e.g.*) 1 Thess. ii. 12, 13. God calls; it is for man to receive and accept the word of His message as a new force of which the potent energy is confined to them that believe. *πεισμογή* may be either active or passive, according to Bishop Lightfoot. It seems best to follow the great Alexandrian and Antiochene commentators whose interpretation has been given, and adopt the passive sense. ("Certe verbale hoc, ut cetera in—*orō*), intransitivum est."—Bengel.) "Persuasion (*i.e.* logical certitude) is not to be expected from Him who calls you." If, with Grimm's ed. of Wilke's *Clavis N.T.* (*s.v.*), we adopt the active meaning, we must understand the word in a bad sense: "It is not God's way to use enticing or plausible arguments to produce conviction: He calls, and you must either obey, or refuse His call." God's method of appealing to men will thus be contrasted with the illicit intriguing and specious pleas of Judaizing pseudo-apostles. But the former rendering is simpler.

CLEMENT BIRD.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Willoughby C. Allen, B.A.	
1. The Aramaic Gospel	386
II. " "	454
Rev. Clement Bird, M.A.	
Brevia: Notes on Galatians v. 8	471
Rev. Professor A. B. Bruce, D.D.	
Paul's Conception of Christianity :	
1. The Sources	1
2. Paul's Religious History	118
3. The Epistle to the Galatians	197
4. The Epistles to the Corinthians	267
5. The Epistle to the Romans—its Aim	353
6. The Epistle to the Romans—the Train of Thought	416
Right Rev. W. B. Carpenter, D.D., Bishop of Ripon.	
The Parable of the Unjust Steward	21
Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.	
Christ at the Pool of Bethesda	136
The First Storm	377
Rev. John A. Cross, M.A.	
On St. John xxi. 15-17	312
Rev. T. Herbert Darlow, M.A.	
Divorce and Childhood	294
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	
The Earlier Ideas of Isaiah	241

	PAGE
Rev. James Denney, B.D.	
Three Motives to Repentance	232
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Literature on the New Testament	146
Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.	
I. Exegetic Studies on the Lord's Prayer	38
II. " " " " "	283
Rev. Professor G. G. Findlay, M.A.	
The Preface to the First Epistle of John	97
Right Rev. Lord Arthur C. Hervey, Bishop of Bath and Wells.	
The Chronology of Ezra ii. and iv. 6-23	431
Rev. Alex. Mair, D.D.	
Apologetic Argument from the Names in Romans xvi.	75
Rev. Professor W. Milligan, D.D.	
I. Hebrews vi. 4-6	367
II. " "	443
Rev. J. O. F. Murray, M.A.	
Evangelium Secundum Petrum	50
Professor Hort—Bibliography	238
Professor W. M. Ramsay, M.A.	
The late Professor Hort	72
About the Sixth Hour	216
Rev. Professor J. Armitage Robinson, M.A.	
The late Professor Hort	62
Rev. Professor W. Sanday, D.D., LL.D.	
Professor Ramsay's "Church in the Roman Empire"	401
Rev. Professor G. A. Smith, D.D.	
Galilee	161
The Lake of Galilee	321
Rev. Walter C. Smith, D.D., LL.D.	
The Washing of the Disciples' Feet	300

Rev. James Staiker, D.D.

The Difficult Words of Christ :

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| 1. The Children at Play | 29 |
| 2. Holy Violence | 224 |

Rev. Professor V. H. Stanton, D.D.

Some Points in the Synoptic Problem :

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. The Part Played by Oral Tradition in Deducing the
Form and Contents of the Synoptic Gospels | 81 |
| 2. The Supposed Relation of St. Matthew and St.
Luke to the "Logia" as Common Source | 179 |
| 3. Some Secondary Features | 256 |
| 4. The Authorship and Composition of the Third Gospel | 336 |

Rev. John Taylor, D.Lit.

Wellhausen's "Minor Prophets" 108

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xlix. 20	166	Matthew v. 48	393
xlix. 21	166	vi. 9	38
Exodus xix. 24	231	vi. 9	283
Deuteronomy xxiv. 1-4	294	viii. 14-17	192
xxxii. 18	398	viii. 23	377
Joshua xix. 35	327	xi. 12	224
Judges v. 18	168	xi. 16-19	29
1 Kings xx.	174	xii. 15-21	187
Ezra ii.	431	xiii. 6	390
iv. 6-23	431	xix. 3-15	294
Nehemiah vii. 70	437	Mark	256
Psalms cxxxiii.	164	2-4	397
Isaiah	241	v. 35	377
iii. 16	252	v. 9	334
vi. 1-4	172	vi. 32.	323
viii. 22	244	xv. 39.	58
Ezekiel xlvi. 8	161	Luke iv. 9-13	188
Hosea xiv. 5	163	iv. 25	178
Amos i. 9-12	111	vii. 37	333
v. 3.	112	viii. 6	390
v. 18.	253	viii. 22	377
v. 26	113	ix. 25	333
ix. 1.	113	ix. 54	167
Micah i. 7	115	xiii. 1-9	232
Matthew v. 31 32	296	xvi. 1-12	21

	PAGE		PAGE
Luke xvi. 12	28	1 Corinthians ix. 1-6	269
xxiii. 44	216	xv. 3, 4	16
John iv. 3.	94	xv. 8	122
v. 1	136	xv. 10	274
vi. 18.	295	2 Corinthians	278
xiii. 1-17	300	ii. 14	274
xxi. 15-17	312	iii. 1, 2.	275
Acts	336	iii. 18	271
ii. 9	404	iv. 7	277
xiii. 38, 39	17	Galatians	197
xvi. 8	404	i. 13, 14	119
xvi. 10-17	343	ii. 4	9
xvii. 30, 31	14	ii. 6	204
xviii. 5.	9	ii. 16	417
xxvi. 14	126	iii. 1	129
Romans	353	iii. 6-9	208
i. 17	416	iv. 4, 5	212
ii.	359	iv. 6	429
ii. 21-23	420	v. 8	471
iii. 1-18	421	vi. 11-17	215
iv.	423	vi. 17.	201
vii. 8	120	vi. 17	278
vii. 12	359	1 Thess. i. 4	12
xi. 16-21	359	ii. 2-9	14
xv. 22-33	365	Hebrews vi. 4-6	367, 443
xvi.	75	1 John i. 1-4	97
xvi. 25.	1	Rev. xiii. 14	412
1 Corinthians	267		

